Imprimatur.

GILB. IRONSIDE.

Vice-Can. Oxon.

Feb. 21. 1688.

Imprimatur.

GILB. IRONSIDE.

Vice-Can. Oxon.

Feb. 21. 1688.

A N

ANSWER

To a Diſcourſe concerning the

CELIBACY

OF THE

CLERGY,

Printed at OXFORD.

by Dr Tully

Marriage is honourable in all, and the Bed undefiled, but Whore-mongers and Adulterers God will judge. Heb. 13. 4.

George Tully.

OXFORD,

Printed at the THEATER, for *Richard Chiſwell* at the *Roſe* and *Crown* in S. Pauls Church Yard, *London*. *Ann.* 1688.

THE PREFACE.

NOtwithſtanding my averſion to *Apologies*, I find my ſelf oblig'd to make one, for letting this *Anſwer* come abroad now, when ſo juſt a *Diſcourſe* upon the ſame ſubject has been ſo lately publiſht at *London*. My *Apology* is, that my *Papers* were out of my own power, having been committed to the *Preſs*, and a good part of 'em wrought off, at leaſt three weeks before the *London Diſcourſe* appear'd, by whatever accident they now wait on it at ſo great a diſtance: and they, at whoſe deſire I writ, thought it both requiſite in it ſelf, and no diſreſpect to the *London-Author*, to give a particular and formal *Anſwer*, to a *Pamphlet* of our own growth, which He perhaps for that reaſon

reaſon thought not fit to take notice of. The Reader will I doubt too ſoon diſcover that ſo large an interval of time was not ſpent in writing this diſcourſe; the very length of it will convince him, that the writer had not time enough to make a ſhorter. Indeed it has ſwell'd I know not well how, as much beyond the dimenſions I at firſt deſign'd it, as beyond the merits of the Pamphlet, it pretends to Anſwer. But I muſt aſcribe this chiefly, to the ſtudy'd brevity and obſcurity of my Adverſary: had He been longer and plainer I could have been much ſhorter. But it is the peculiar Character of his works, that the main ſtrength of 'em conſiſts in the deep way, that leads to their meaning, the uncomfortable darkneſs of the journey, and thoſe aſperities of ſtyle, wherein He has wrapt up his Conceptions; much like thoſe Barbarous Countryes, whoſe difficulty of acceſs, and natural barrenneſs of Soil, are their ſtrongeſt ſecurities againſt a forreign invaſion.

I am not inſenſible of one principal aim, the Author ſeems to have in the argument of Celibacy at this time, which beſides its primary intention of blacking Luther, *was doubtleſs*

doubtless designd to throw dirt likewise upon our married Clergy, for, even our use of the institution of God Himself, and a Sacrament of their own, shall be trumpt up against us, for want of better game. Well! it enough to confound a thinking Man, to consider what a noise Luther's *marriage has made in the world, how one justifiable match with* Katharine Bora *has been more tragically represented than all those abominable bestialities, which S.* Paul *tells us 'tis a shame to speake of, yet it seems the* Roman Celibacy *can come to terms with. Nay, as if it had been a small thing to bespatter* Luther *in a set Volumn, upon this, as other trivial, or imaginary, occasions, out comes a late Grammatical Master of controversies, and Retails the fulsome aspersions of this Pamphlet upon* Luther, *without the least regard had to the late just and ingenious defence of Him, as if the Gentleman had convers'd altogether in another world, even whilst he is diverting this. But confidence is a happy talent at some time of day?*

I shall not enlarge farther here, but refer the Reader to the ensueing answer, wherein I hope I have done Luther *and the Married*

ried Clergy right, as to any thing, my Author has in this Pamphlet, ſuggeſted againſt them, and I was no farther concern'd. If I have not, I am ſure 'tis not the fault of the argument, but my own.

An

An Answer to a Discourse concerning the Celibacy of the Clergy.

THE Author of this Discourse, *with the true air of a Guide in Controversies*, requires it to be absolutely *granted* Him, as if he wrote *ex cathedra*, that the single has the advantage of the married life, as to all acts of Piety and Devotion; *and so* consequently, *for gaining the Kingdom of Heaven.* But we have had so many late pretenders to demonstration, that I must beg His pardon, if I offer to dispute, what He has thought fit to lay down as a *postulatum.* And truly the matter will admit of a short and easie decision, if we distinguish only, in the Language of the Schools, betwixt single life, *objectively* consider'd in it self, and *subjectively*, with relation to persons; in which latter acceptation alone it becomes the subject matter of a Law; which is not fit to be form'd upon abstractions and Ideas, as this of Celibacy is, unless in an Utopian Common-wealth. In it's general notion then single life, I grant, imports a State or Condition less ob- SEC. I.

noxious to cares, ſollicitudes, and diſtractions of mind, impediments to a fervent and intenſe devotion; but *ſubjectively* conſider'd with reference to Us, it ſtands indifferent to all ſpiritual advantages or diſadvantages, according to men's different capacity or incapacity of it. Agreeable whereunto we find our Lord recommending *it*, rather then *Marriage*, not indifferently to all Men, but to thoſe onely, who are *able to receive it*, i. e. *to whom it is*, peculiarly, *given*; the only caſe wherein that Infallible Caſuiſt would admit the general and unlimited ſentence of His Diſciples; who, upon ſtateing Marriage indiſſoluble, unleſs in caſe of fornication, determin'd that *it was good*, then, *not to Marry*. Accordingly His great Apoſtle St. *Paul*, in the 7. Chapter of his firſt Epiſtle to the *Corinthians*, the main ſcene of this Controverſy, prefers not the *Celibate* to the *Conjugal* ſtate in any but thoſe, who are ſingly endow'd with the gift of continency. Thus, in the verſes cited by this Author, for an abſolute preeminence of the one to the other, *It is good*, ſays He, v. 1. *for a Man not to touch a Woman*, i. e. for Him, who can live chaſt and pure without them; why elſe this proviſion in the following verſe? *Nevertheleſs to avoid fornication let every Man have his own Wife &c.* Thus, again in the 8. v. alledg'd by Him: *it is good for them* (i. e. the unmarried and Widows) *if they abide even as I;* but then it follows in the next verſe: *If they cannot contain* (as I do, who am peculiarly endow'd with this gift, v. 7.) *let them Marry;* and that, for this unalterable reaſon, becauſe *it is better to Marry than to Burn;* and ſo of the reſt, it being impoſſible to conceive, that He, who v. 25. *concerning Virgins had no commandment of the Lord,* Theoph. in loc. (but the bare advice of *Qui poteſt capere capiat*) ſhould

Mat. 19. v. 12. compar. with v. 11.

ſhould ever recommend *Virginity*, but in concent with Men's reſpective abilities to receive it. For a forc'd *Celibacy* would be to ſome Men ſo dangerous a *ſnare*, ſo deſtructive of all true Piety and Religion in them, that I defie this Author allmoſt to ſuppoſe any incumbrances or misfortunes to attend the *Married* condition ſo fatal to the purity of devotion, and the performance of all religious offices, as the *Burning* the Apoſtle mentions: that wandring and flameing concupiſcence, which, if not *ſet on fire of Hell*, yet is uſually fed and fomented by it; diſtracting the Thoughts, polluteing the Conſcience, rendring the Man uneaſie to Himſelf, and aſhamed of approching nigh unto God; whereas, on the contrary, *Marriage* in the language of the excellent *Chryſoſtom, carries wonderful conſolation*, and, as *Gregory Nazianzen* ſpeaks, *tranquillity of mind, along with it, whilſt it repreſſes the wild efforts of our nature, calmes our troubled Sea, and drives the veſſel ſecurely to its harbour*. The dignity of the ſubject might deſerve a juſt Panegyric, eſpecially when 'tis conſider'd that I here deal with thoſe, who write Invectives againſt that, which they have nevertheleſs adopted into the number of their *Sacraments*; and I cannot forbear to remark the peculiar honour God was pleas'd to do it, as under the *Law*, in admitting the *Married Moſes* to ſo intimate a familiarity with him, if I may ſo ſpeak, above all the reſt of Mankind, ſo, more eſpecially, under the *Goſpel*, in our Saviour's commenceing his miraculous Operations at the ſolemnity of a *Marriage*, and ſingling it out for an emblem of his Spiritual conjunction with his Church. I have not dwelt very long upon ſtateing this matter in anſwer to my Author's peremptorie aſſertion about it: and yet muſt

Homil. 21. in Gen. In funere Gorgoniæ.

beg the Reader's pardon for ſo unneceſſary an undertaking, the Author himſelf having effectually done it to my hands in his fifth and eleventh Paragraphs; ſuppoſing, and acknowledging, theſe *fruits of righteouſneſs*, as He ſtiles them, *producible in the Married condition*; and *that* therefore, ſo farr, not inferior to the ſingle life.

I am not inſenſible of the farther advantages He ſuggeſts, in this Paragraph, on the ſide of the *Celibate*, that it gives greater ſcope to *works of Charity*, and more eaſie diſpoſitions to a free and generous temper. To which it might be ſufficient to reply, that 'tis great folly at leaſt, if not impiety, in Men, to think of amending God's order and Conſtitution of things by Schemes and Models of their own contrivance, which, inſtead of reforming *one accidental*, evil, uſually open the way to a *thouſand*, which upon ſuch fooliſh proviſion, become *neceſſary* and *unavoidable*; as experience and reaſon moſt eminently *atteſt* in the caſe before us. But yet farther, we can leſs brook this pretence of a *diſintereſs'd* Conſtitution in that Church, which all the world ſees is form'd purely upon the Idea of ſecular greatneſs and advantage; and that in the very caſe before us; as we ſhall ſee hereafter. And I want to be inform'd, why 'tis not as commendable in a Clergy Man decently to provide for a family of his *own*, as for a Pope, Cardinal, or *Roman* Prelate, to enrich and aggrandize their *ſpurious* offſpring, their Nephews, Relations, Favorites, and Dependants; the notorious and allow'd practice of the Eccleſiaſtic Grandees of that Communion. I could preſent this *Diſcourſer* with a long bill of complaints of the inſatiably avaritious temper of the Clergy of His Church, from ſeveral eminent Members of it; but I muſt

See §. 34.

muſt confeſs one would be a little ſurpris'd to find the Infection ſpread it ſelf within the very walls of the Cloiſters; and yet a late ingenious Writer of their own has aſſured us, * *that every rich Convent*, in a Neigbouring Country, *has its Monk, whoſe peculiar employ it is to provide for titles to Eſtates when they want them*, &c. *There are*, ſays He, *ſome of theſe Orders, as, for inſtance, that of St.* Bennet, *who have their Penſioners in the Court of Parliament at* Paris, *as another Order theirs in the Court of Aydes, to gain them all their Cauſes; and hence proceed thoſe frequent attempts they make upon the goods of their Neigbours, whom they rob as often as they can; Some Perſons of Credit, and who know it very well, have aſſured me, that, that ſingle Order alone diſpoſes of two hundred thouſand Livers a year in Penſions to ſeveral Officers of Parliament; what diſorder this occaſions any one may judge.*

Upon the whole therefore, whatſoever Church would endeavour effectually to reform any abuſes they apprehend in the Covetouſneſs of their Clergy, muſt, I conceive, begin at their *Inclinations*, and not at their *Circumſtances*; take what care they can to admit none into the ſervice of the Church, but who, they have reaſon to beleive are, in the character required by the Apoſtle, ἀφιλάργυροι καὶ μὴ αἰσχροκερδεῖς, not covetous nor given to filthy lucre; and not, as this *Diſcourſer* would have it, prohibit them Marriage, a plaiſter inadequate to the ſore, and which, beſides, inſtead of healing *one* wound in the Church, opens a *thouſand*.

The next Paragraph, with all its garniture of Texts and Parentheſes, amounts only to thus much, that there is *a greater purity of Body* in the *Virginal* than §. 2.

* Moyens ſurs & honnetes pour la converſion de tous les Heretiques. p. 274.

in the *Matrimonial* ſtate. Now by *Purity* this *Diſcourſer* underſtands either a purity *phyſical*, which brings no advantage to his cauſe; or elſe He means a *moral* purity, and then, according to his own de-
Par. 20. termination, He comes within the Character of thoſe who teach diabolical Doctrine. So that, in this Paragraph, He has play'd either the Impertinent, or the Devil; and yet I hope the Reader will be ſo kind as to pardon Him for the civility He has at the ſame time expreſs'd in an intire yielding us of his cauſe, by freely acknowledging that *concupiſcence cannot be remedied*, whereas 'tis yet the whole ſcope and deſign of his Pamphlet, to prove that it *may*, and that univerſally, not by *Marriage*, but without it.

§. 3. But ſtill, *we find abſtinence from the lawful acts of the conjugal bed advis'd for the better performance of holy duties &c.* as, in Exod 19. 15. 1 Sam. 21. 4. *&c.* To which he Himſelf, as conſcious of the weakneſs of his Argument, has furniſh'd us with an Anſwer, that this *was only Old-Teſtament Ceremonial Holyneſs.* For, He knew very well, that, notwithſtanding the rather higher perfection of Morality required under the *Goſpel* than under the *Law*, the latter plac'd, a *ritual and external* impurity in many of thoſe creatures and
Heb. 9. 10. actions, wherein the former placeth none; *their waſhings* and other *carnal ordinances* being *impoſed on them till the time of the Reformation only*; and can never therefore be made the foundation of an Argument for the like abſtinence under the Goſpel.

But rather, on the contrary, we may hence take juſt occaſion to plead for the allowance of Marriage to the Clergy now, when all the former imputations of impurity are vaniſh'd, ſince God was pleas'd to allow it the

the Jewiſh Prieſthood, when they were in their full force and vigour; nay, even the High-Prieſt Himſelf, notwithſtanding He was bound every day to a morning and an evening Sacrifice. I need not trouble my ſelf nor my Reader with a tedious application of what has been ſaid, to the Texts He alleges; the vanity of his reaſoning will diſcover it ſelf beyond what I have here ſuggeſted to any one who conſults but his Bible about them. But yet we find a like injunction, or rather advice, of abſtinence, under the Goſpel: *Defraud ye not one the other, except it be with conſent for a time, that ye may give your ſelves to faſting and prayer.* 1 Cor. 7. 5. But then, firſt, this Counſel extends only to times of more ſolemn and extraordinary addreſſes to God; for that Apoſtle does not adviſe this abſtinence ſimply, that we may the better pray, but that we may *give our ſelves* to it *. And who ever diſputed the juſt *decorum* and *gravity* of ſuch abſtinence as this? For 2*dly*, this is not yielded Him upon the account of any peculiar *enmity* betwixt lawful acts in this kind and *ſpiritual exerciſes*, which He, fooliſhly, proves from *exceſſes* only committed in the former, which no man pretends to juſtify; but on the ſcore of that due regard we ought to have even to *external purity* in our more ſolemn approches to the throne of grace, And, 3*dly*, what, in the name of common ſence, is all this to the eſtabliſhment of a Law of perpetual Celibacy? eſpecially when the ſequel of the verſe, upon which he inſiſts, ſpoken indifferently of all Men, enjoyns all (Clergy as well as Laity, if the one are Men, and ſubject to temptations as well as the other) *to come together again, that Satan tempt them not for*

* οὐκ εἶπεν ἁπλῶς ἵνα προσεύξησθε, ἀλλ' ἵνα σχολάζητε τῇ προσευχῇ. Chryſ. & Theoph. in loc.

their

their incontinency; and, * as one this *Diſcourſer* knows very well in his Paraphraſe upon this place, adds, *inability to forbear*? And yet this is the very Man, whoſe chief aim in this Pamphlet, is, to prove the direct contrary poſition, that all Men have ability to forbear. So natural it is for a bad cauſe to make a Man give himſelf the lye, and ſave his Adverſary that piece of ill breeding.

§. 4. His fourth Paragraph being wholly taken up in an Argument forreign to the main ſcope of his Book, the ſecond Marriages of Church Widows, mention'd 1 *Tim.* 5. 9. I ſhall not here particularly dwell upon it, but refer the Reader to the interpretation of a
See § 32 parallel place, 1 *Tim.* 3, 2, 12. the limitation of Church Widows here to one Husband, admitting the ſame expoſition with that of Biſhops and Deacons to one Wife, notwithſtanding any thing He has here alleg'd to the contrary; and even granting all that can be rationally infer'd from this Diſcourſe upon this Topic, that ſecond Marriages are not quite ſo honourable,
1 Tim. 5. 14. nor decent for thoſe that are engag'd in the ſervice of the Church, yet ſince the Apoſtle allows theſe very
See §. Widows to Remarry upon their inability to contain, as will hereafter appear, the *diſpleaſure* He expreſſes at their Remarrying concerns only their violation of that *Order* and *Decorum* they had peculiarly engaged to obſerve; but confirms ſtill the main point in Controverſy, that Continency is not univerſally acquirable, and leaves them, as well as the Widows in the Text liberty to Remarry, who cannot attain to it, which is all we contend for.

§. 5. Proceed we then, in the next place, to the conſideration of the *Celibate*, abſtractively taken, in it ſelf,

* A Paraph. & Annot. on all the Epiſtles of St. Paul at the Theater in Oxford. 1684.

without

without relation to the virtues and graces attainable in it; even in this narrow acceptation the Diſcourſer will have it *worthy of, and ſo as to have promiſed to it a higher reward and crown in the World to come.* But, firſt, if all the *perfection*, in his phraſe, of the ſingle life conſiſts in thoſe noble qualifications of mind, He has mention'd in th 11*th* Paragraph, as the peculiar products of the ſingle life, which He there aſſerts, I would fain know what *intrinſic worth* He can find in it, conſider'd apart from them, unleſs the perfection of a thing do not include all the degrees of worth in it? as He would be thought to diſcourſe very looſly, who placing the excellency of faſting, for example, in the mortification of Mens luſts &c. ſhould yet talk of I know not what inherent merit in the very *opus operatum* (if I may ſo call it) of an empty Stomach; abſtinence from meats, drinks, women, &c. being in it ſelf, where not commanded, of a purely *phyſical* nature, and, conſequently, of no value, but as it tends, and is made uſe of, to the advancement of a *moral* end; and which can never therefore, of it ſelf, entitle a Man to an higher degree of Glory hereafter, as this Author pretends, becauſe no *degree of Sanctity* here, as He vainly ſuppoſes, and I would only deſire Him to ſalve the Honour of St. *Peter*, againſt the fair competition of St *John*, upon the doctrine he has advanc'd; for the latter having the advantage of this peculiar *Sanctity* of the ſingle life on his ſide, muſt, according to Him, move in a higher Orb of Glory than the Prince of the Apoſtles himſelf, unleſs he will ſay St. *John* fell ſhort of him in all other Graces, and ſo make the object of our Savior's more peculiar love, a leſs degree of goodneſs. As to the more ample promiſes He mentions to Virgins under the Goſpel, He refers us to the 12. v. of the 19*th* of St. *Matth.* where

there is not one title that looks fairly that way, and himſelf grew ſick of the fancy, before he got to the end of the Paragraph.

From theſe out-guards of Argument, He begins now to advance to the main body of his forces, and to bring home the point to the Clergy; and if it be an inauſpicious omen of ſucceſs, to falter in the firſt ſtep, He makes, He has certainly little reaſon to hope for the victory. For here He is pleas'd to adviſe them to the Celibate, *ſo far onely as they find themſelves capable of it*, a thing utterly deſtructive of the whole deſign of his Pamphlet, which is to aſſert the juſtice of the Law of ſingle life, upon this ſole medium, that all Men are capable of an intire obſervation of it.

§. 6. After this compariſon of the ſingle and conjugal ſtate, our Diſcourſer proceeds, in the next Paragraph, to prove, *that Continency is the gift of God*, in which we readily joyn with him, not Doubting but that the ſequel of his own Aſſertion will prove more fatal to the cauſe, He maintains, than to ours. However, upon this foundation He begins immediatly to build, and has rais'd us, in the firſt place, a ſuperſtructure of two Pages of ſuch *hay and Stubble* as will not endure p. 5. the leaſt *Wind of* ſound *Doctrine*. *When ever Marriage, or the uſe of it is unavoidably hinder'd, or by God Himſelf alſo prohibited, there*, ſays He, *alſo is given by him the power to contain.* And then reckons up a long Catalogue of Inſtances in confirmation of this myſterious truth. Is not this Induſtrious impertinence? for where's the Argument? God will not be wanting to us in thoſe neceſſities he lays upon us, but will perform his own promiſes of not ſuffering us to be tempted above what we are able to bear; and therefore neither will He be wanting to us in thoſe, we raſhly and for the moſt

part

part, unwarrantably, impoſe upon our ſelves, and will perform *our* promiſes, as faithfully as his *own*. He will give us grace againſt Fornication and Uncleanneſs, when He himſelf has denyed us the uſe of Marriage, and therefore likewiſe will afford us the ſame grace againſt the uſe of his own conſtitution, Marriage it ſelf, when we have a mind to deny it our ſelves. Is not this the Logic which the Devil us'd to our Saviour, when, from the ordinary methods of God's providence, he would needs have perſwaded him to tempt him? The excellent managerie of the Inſtances he brings upon this Argument, as concerning Husbands ſecurity of their Wives honeſty, upon the offer of Continency on God's part, and the like, would allmoſt tempt a Man to be pleaſant with him for the diverſion of his Reader; but having before overthrown his edifice of Straw, I ſhall not ſtay to pick them up ſingle and play with them. p. 6.

The next Paragraph is one of the Rudeſt contradictions to the great Apoſtle's rule of preferring Marriage to *burning*, that ever dropt perhaps from the Pen of a Bigot; perſwading Men to defer the remedy of incontinencie, tho' they actually labour under the Diſtemper, for this weighty reaſon, that; they are not ſure but that God even then does, or, at leaſt may hereafter, proffer them ſtrength to recover without it, which is, in the ſame Apoſtle's language, no better than for a Man, having been tempted of the Devil through his incontinency, to tempt God, in the ſecond place, for an extraordinary cure of it. To what exceſs of lewdneſs will not this Doctrine expoſe the ſinful fleſh and blood we carry about us? For I would fain know of him, why if upon a bare ſuppoſition, that God may Par. 9. §. 7.

hereafter give us grace to ſubdue our Luſts without Marriage, we may therefore defer it, we may not as well ſtill put it of, after twenty, or an hundred acts of uncleanneſs and fornication, as after one, as he minces the matter. Nay, he himſelf has avow'd the inference in that Latitude we put, in the very line before, in encouraging us to an averſion to Marriage, from the example of thoſe, who, he ſays, *of Debauch'd, have at length, become chaſt without it;* never conſidering that 'tis oftner the weakneſs of Nature, than the ſtrength of Grace, that puts a ſtop to irregularities of this groſs and corporeal kind. But why, after all, may not a Man know that God has not given him the power to contain? Certainly St. *Paul* ſuppoſes the experiment practicable, when upon Burning, he infers an inability to contain, and thereupon commands to Marry. In ſhort therefore, to ſatisfie my Author, when a Man, after all his honeſt endeavours conducive to the ſuppreſſion of the natural Flame of his Luſt, findes it ſtill break out upon him with greater impetuoſity perhaps than before, ſeizing upon his will, diſtracting his thoguhts, and rendring the whole Man irkſome and uneaſy (for true Celibacy conſiſts in a purity of Spirit as well as of Body) then is he ſubject to the tyranny of that *Burning* the Apoſtle mentions, and has no reaſon to expect he was ever deſign'd for the Virginal ſtate, and, unleſs he will be govern'd by my Author's advice, rather than by St. [a] *Paul's* injunction, is thereupon bound to Marry.

§. 8. Par. 10, 11. I will not vex my Reader's patience with particular reflections upon the odd reaſonings, he has

[a] 1 Cor. 7. 9.

crowded

crowded up into the two following Sections, but ſhall willingly grant him what he ſo earneſtly labours for from them, *that Celibacy is not abſolutely neceſſary to any*, not even to thoſe, Who have the power to contain, *nor*, conſequently, *Marriage to any one a ſin, in relation to that power*. For herein I have the warrant of the Apoſtle himſelf, who, [a] *having no commandment of the Lord* concerning ſuch perſons, leaves them, in the Spirit of an Apoſtle, to their liberty and diſcretion in this matter; interpoſing only his advice, that, in caſe of [b] *preſent diſtreſs*, which will expoſe them to *trouble in the fleſh*, perſons ſo qualified had better make uſe of the gift wherewith God has endow'd them, than intangle themſelves in the conjugal ſtate. But ſtill I deny this Diſcourſer's illation thence, that the words of our Saviour in the 19*th* of St. [c] *Matthew* (*He that is able to receive it let him receive it*) import any *counſel of perfection*. For where lyes the perfection of the ſingle ſtate above the Matrimonial? not in the means of this pretended perfection it affords; for that my Author has yet the grace to diſown; tho' he knows the perfection, the Saints of the Cloiſters pretend to, is made by them to conſiſt in ſuch a ſuperabundance of penance and mortification, as that they actually do more good, and ſuffer greater rigours, than is requiſite for their own Salvation, and, conſequently, add to the treaſure of the Church, which is thereby enabl'd to afford her Cuſtomers a good penny-worth of merits and ſatisfaction, when they are diſpos'd to buy. Where then is the boaſted perfection of the ſingle ſtate? in it abſtractively conſider'd in it ſelf, without relation to the grace that may be acquir'd in it? no; but in the grace p. 9.

a 1 Cor. 7. 25, 26, 27, 28. b Ibid. v. 26. c v. 12.

P. 9. it ſelf, *in the greater purity from Sin, and greater practice of holy Duties* attainable by it. But are all theſe Divine qualities without the reach of the Matrimonial condition? no; in the Confeſſion of my Adverſary Himſelf, they are all acquirable, tho' in his opinion *not ſo eaſily* in that too. Not ſo eaſily perhaps by all Men, but yet more eaſily by others, as we have already evinc'd. So, that, upon the whole, the celebrated *counſel of perfection*, upon which my Author lays ſo much ſtreſs in the ſequel of this Diſcourſe, amounts only to this, that our Saviour (agreeable to what we have before obſerv'd from St. *Paul*) adviſes thoſe, who are able, that is, thoſe to whom the gift of continency is given, to make uſe of their gift in this way to the Kingdome of Heaven, rather than Marry.

Ibid.

See §. 1.

§. 1.

I have only one piece of Advice to the Diſcourſer before I diſmiſs this Argument; and that is, whilſt he is in too eager and blunder'd a purſuit of his Adverſarie's Cauſe, he would take care not to fall foul upon his own, which yet he moſt unmercifully does. For if a Man, can never be conſcious to himſelf that he is endow'd with this gift, and if, beſides it may be *withdrawn*, as he urges, I would gladly be reſolv'd, if the ſuppoſition of its univerſality render it leſs obnoxious to thoſe exceptions; make it more eaſily diſcernable, or leſs ſubject to be taken away; and if not, I would deſire him, in the next place, to inform me, why any Man ſhould oblige himſelf, or be bound by others, to the *perpetual* preſervation of it.

Par. 10. & 11.

§. 9. And now we come to the direct proof of the great leading point, the, pretended, univerſality of this gift, becauſe it is the ſole medium upon which he defends

[a] Mat 9. v. 11, 12. compared.

the

the injunction of Celibacy to the Clergy, and the indeleble obligation of the Vow of Continency, I ſhall farther, and in the firſt place, attempt a poſitive and direct proof of the contrary, *that all men cannot poſſibly contain.* Where, to prevent cavils, I would not be underſtood of a *total* and *abſolute impoſſibility*; for ſo nothing is impoſſible, but what implies a contradiction, and thereupon tranſcends infinite power it ſelf; but I mean, for diſtinction ſake, an *impoſſibility natural,* ſuch as the circumſtances of humanity, in conjunction with the Oeconomy of God's providence and dealing with Men, being conſider'd, renders this or that utterly unattainable, either by them all in general, as *perfection*, for example, in this frail and mortal condition, or, at leaſt by the greateſt part of them, as *Virginal Chaſtity*; the very inſtance in this caſe of [a] *Suarez* himſelf, who tells us, that God did never therefore univerſally require it, and, for the ſame reaſon, can never univerſally adviſe it, as this diſcourſer pretends,) becauſe not poſſible *according to nature,* (i. e.) as he explains himſelf, *conſiderata fragilitate & conditione naturæ,* as will farther appear from the following reflexions; firſt, in relation to the circumſtances of Humanity; and ſecondly, in reference to the Divine diſpoſal and management of human affairs. As to the firſt of theſe, we are to conſider, in the firſt place, that ſtrong, and natural propenſity, which the Divinity implanted in each Sex to the other at their very Creation, in a ſtate of innocence and perfection it ſelf. Secondly, the heightning and improvement of theſe natural tendencies ſince the fall. Thirdly, that this is abſolutely the moſt violent and predominant paſſion, to which Humanity is ſubject. And Fourthly, that

[a] L. 1. de leg. c. 9. num. 19.

ſome

ſome Mens tempers and conſtitution carry them to it with much greater impetuoſity than thoſe of other Men. Upon the ſtrength of which conſiderations, I
Par. 25. have the coſeſſion of the Diſcourſer himſelf: that *the act and exerciſe of Continency and Purity is much more difficultly attain'd than any other matter of a vow whatever.* Which extreame *difficulty*, acknowledg'd by him, we may juſtly advance into *impoſſibility* it ſelf; if we conſider, in the ſecond place, in relation to the Divine Oeconomy of things, firſt, That the great and general lines at leaſt of every Man's ſtate of life are all pre-ordain'd and chalk'd out according to the rules of an infinite Wiſdome and Fore-ſight. Secondly, that, As God has doubtleſs reſerv'd ſome to ſerve him in a continent, ſo a great many more in a conjugal ſtate, according to that original and authentic declaration of his will concerning the increaſe of our Kind, in order whereunto he has furniſh'd, we ſee, the generality of Men with thoſe ſtrong natural propenſions before mention'd, and whom we cannot therefore ſuppoſe he will ever endow with the gift of perpetual Virginity, becauſe repugnant to his pre-ordain'd diſpoſal of them; ſo that, unleſs it can be ſhown, that God, at the firſt inſtitution of Marriage, for the end of propagation, has totally excepted thoſe, who ſhould Miniſter at his Altar, or ſuch as ſhould Vow Continency, out of the number of thoſe, whom he deſign'd to accompliſh his will in this kind, the gift in debate muſt needs be unattainable, as by the generality of Men, ſo by ſeveral, both *Prieſts*, and *Votaries*, bound to the perpetual preſervation of it; which was to be ſhown. But come we now to conſider his Arguments to the contrary.

§. 10. And the firſt, fetch'd from the difficulty of diſcern-

ing

ing this gift, receives it's ſolution from what has been already premis'd. For, if a Man may diſcover when he is *not endow'd* with it, and has, thereupon, ſufficient grounds to believe the Divine Wiſdom deſigns him for another ſtate of life, as we have already ſeen, He may likewiſe, by the rule of contraries, diſcern when he is *endow'd* with it and act accordingly. Would our Author but be pleas'd to bleſs the World with the publication of his *Notes of Grace*, we might then poſſibly receive ſome farther ſatisfaction in this point, hopeing that he has *noted* out *Grace* more ſucceſsfully, than *Bellarmin* has a *Church*. However in the mean time 'tis certainly very hard, that he will not allow a Man to know, what Saint *Paul* ſuppoſes knowable enough, whether *He ſtand ſtedfaſt in his own heart, have any neceſſity* of Marriage, or *power over his own will* to abſtain from it. And the objection againſt the poſſibility of this Knowledg, from the *uncertain ſucceſs of future conflicts with temptations*, ſeemes to be one of the moſt trifling cavils, that ever dropt from ſuch an *Oracle of Controverſy*; beſides that it wounds his own cauſe to the heart. For, firſt, here's a wild appearance of an Argument from the uncertanty of *perſeverance* to the uncertainty of *poſſeſſion*, a ſort of reaſoning, if good, that deſtroys all certainty of Knowledg in us, in relation to any other Graces of God's Spirit, Faith, Humility, or the like, as well as in reference to this. For, who can know the ſucceſs of *future conflicts with temptations* to pride, infidelity, *&c?* And, Secondly if perſeverance be ſo nice a thing as he repreſents it, with what Conſcience can the Church of *Rome* lay a perpetual obligation of *Continency* on ſo great a number of Her Members?

See §. 7.

P. 34.

Par. 10. p. 8.

[a] 1 Cor. 7. 37.

§. 11. The ſubſtance of his ſecond Argument amounts to no more than this: that the Inſtitution of Marriage againſt Fornication is *no ſufficient reaſon*, why all Men may not Contain without either the one, or the other; for being appointed only *as a remedy of our Weakneſs, it ought not to be made an Argument of the reſtraint of God's goodneſs, and bounty*. But, beſides that it is hard to conceive where the *weakneſs* is, if all Men may contain, what need there is of a *remedy*, where there is no *diſeaſe*, but what is curable without it; the anſwer is, that God's *goodneſs and bounty* ought not to be extended to thoſe inſtances, wherein Men have no reaſon to expect it: as *they* certainly have none in relation to this gift, whom he has deſign'd to act the conjugal part upon the ſtage of the World; their natural concupiſcence being the general incentive, made uſe of, to induce them to the accompliſhment of his will in this matter.

§. 12. But becauſe this Author here, as elſe where, lays ſo much ſtreſs upon the ſuppoſition of Men's *earneſt* deſires of this gift for the poſſibility of an univerſal attainment of it, I ſhall endeavour to ſet him right in this matter; which will eaſily be done, if he do but conſider that the *lawfulneſs* of our petitions abſtracted from the neceſſity of the matter of them, tho' ſufficient to juſtifie them, is yet no certain ground for our hopes of obtaining them. As, his prayers, for inſtance, who ſhould beſeech the Divine goodneſs to reſcue him from under the preſſure of a preſent temptation, or affliction, would certainly be conformable enough to the divine *Law*, becauſe agreeable to God's *declar'd* will; yet after the repulſe our *Saviour* himſelf, and his great Apoſtle, St. *Paul*, met with in their petitions of this

[a] Matt. 26. 39. 2 Cor. 12. 8.

kind,

kind, no man can reaſonably preſume upon the grant of ſuch a requeſt, for all it's conformity to the Divine goodneſs, and *reveal'd* will. And therefore he, who was the Wiſdom of the Father qualified his prayer with this proviſo, *if it be poſſible*, or, conſiſtent with his ſecret predeterminations to the contrary; and his Apoſtle, in the very ſame caſe of tribulation, when we are in ſuch ſtraits that we know not what to pray for as we ought, whether for deliverance out of our afflictions, or for conſtancy under them, tells us, that the Spirit, in ſuch caſes, helpes our infirmities, and directs us to put up our petitions *according to the will*, the *ſecret* will of God; either of the two requeſts, whether for the deliverance *from*, or reſolution *under* our troubles, being agreeable to the *reveal'd* declaration of his will. He, again, who labouring under poverty, ſhould, in all humility, ask riches of God; with no other intention than that of Charity, and beneficence to the poor, joyning thereunto all honeſt human Endeavours, would certainly put up a very lawful requeſt to God; and yet cannot every petitioner preſume upon the grant of ſuch requeſt, and the ſucceſs of his endeavours, becauſe the Divine Wiſdom, for reaſons beſt known to himſelf, has deſign'd him to act ſome inferior part in the world. And therefore all that we can depend upon in our prayers of this *lawful* indeed, but, not *neceſſary*, matter, is, not that if we ask aright, we ſhall receive allways *in kind*, but may hereafter expect an *equivalent*; not allways *riches* to do good, for inſtance, yet *contentment* under a meaner diſpenſation: not perhaps *deliverance* out of troubles, yet *patience* under them: not *virginal*, yet *conjugal*, chaſtity: for God grants not our prayers of

this nature, according to *our* desires, and judgement of things, but his *own*, accordingly as he sees the matter of them most conducive to our happiness, and his own glory. And therefore he, (to bring the matter home) who, finding himself tempted and in a continual Burning State, shall, upon the score of his *earnest* and repeated requests of continency, obstinately reject that condition of life, which God has, in such case, recommended to him, prescribes to the Divine Providence in what way and condition he shall best serve him, and accordingly, no wonder if he be guilty of fatal miscarriages in it, as experience attests that the Professors of *Celibacy* notoriously are.

§. 13. Thirdly, says he, *there is no reason to make this grace only particular to some few; when as all other graces conversant about the like object*, i. e. *the moderating and subduing of our passions are proclaim'd to be general*, such, for instance, as temperance, sobriety, and the like.

'Tis answer'd, first, that our Salvation is immediately concern'd in graces of this nature, which 'tis confessed on all hands, not to be in that of continency; and therefore no parity of reason for an equal extent of both. Secondly, that *these* graces are only conversant about the *regulating* exterior acts, *this* about a total *restraint* of one kind of them; the *one* about *excesses* in our natural actions, the *other* about the total *suppression* of a natural act it self; and therefore, tho'

p. 10. with my Author, as no Man *is necessitated to be immoderate in Meat, Drink, Sleep, &c.* So is no Man necessitated to be immoderate in acts of the other kind. (For no Man is forc'd upon Sin) Yet, on the other hand, as Eating, Drinking, and Sleeping are in themselvs

themſelvs neceſſary to all Men, ſo, We ſay, are conjugal acts equally natural, and neceſſary, to ſome.

To the obſervation he makes concerning the difference betwixt this gift, and the extraordinary χαρίσματα of God's Spirit, 'tis ſufficient to reply, that, as it do's not altogether partake of their nature; ſo neither of that of his ordinary operations: for, as it is no way requiſite, like them, to the Salvation of ſuch as are endow'd with it: ſo neither is it univerſally offer'd, as they are. Only it may not be improper farther to remark, that it never comes within the nomination of χάρις, with the *common*, but of χαρίσματα, with the *peculiar* effects of the Spirit; that St. *Paul*, in his exhortation to the *Corinthians*, to walk *as God hath diſtributed to every Man* the gifts of Virginal, or Conjugal chaſtity, ſpeaks in the ſame phraſe with that he uſes in his diſcourſe upon the ſupernatural endowments; and that, laſtly; as, ſpeaking of this gift, he [b] wiſhes all of them who coveted it, (for ſo did ſeveral of the *Corinthians*) were poſſeſs'd of it, as well as he, ſo likewiſe, upon the ſubject of one of the extraordinary graces, the gift of Tongues; he, ſpeaks in the very ſame ſtrain, [c] and upon the ſame occaſion of their earneſt deſire of it: upon which we may juſtly conclude, that, as the one, is not, ſo neither is the other, common to all thoſe, who ſhall never ſo induſtriouſly ſeek it. §. 14.

As to what he here only ſuggeſts concerning the ſame reſtrictions in relation to other graces, as well as to *continency*, which yet we hold univerſal, it will then be time to conſider it, when we come to the paragraph to which he refers us. In the mean while §. 15. p. 11.

[a] 1 Cor. 7. 17. compared with chapter 12. v. 4, 5, 6.

[b] Ibid. v. 7.

[c] Θέλω δὲ πάντας ἀνθρώπους εἶναι &c. 1 Cor. 7. 7. Θέλω δὲ πάντας ὑμᾶς λαλεῖν γλώσσαις, 1 Cor. 14. 5.

therefore paſs we on to his fourth, and laſt effort from reaſon, which is this: that ſince we allow *all Men capable of receiving that other great precept or counſel* (terms Synonimous in his dialect) *for attaining perfection, of quitting ſuperfluous riches*, why not that of *continency* likewiſe? eſpecially, ſince our Saviour pronounces in like manner of the difficulty of *this*, as of the *other*; *'Verily I ſay unto you a rich Man ſhall hardly enter into the Kingdom of Heaven;* that is, in his expoſition, ſhall hardly be brought to part with his ſuperfluities in order to the attainment of that end. I anſwer, the Counſel of perfection, to uſe his own Cant, deducible from this paſſage of our Saviour, amounts, in plainer engliſh, only to this; that we are by his advice of [*'Go and ſell what thou haſt, and give to the poor,*] counſel'd to part with our deareſt enjoyments, when, by, otherwiſe invincible, temptations to Sin, we find they ſtand in competition with the Kingdom of Heaven, rather than apparently hazard our Salvation by retaining them. But now what a wide difference is there betwixt the difficulty of all Mens receiving this ſaying, and that other of living ſingle? the difficulty of the former is purely accidental, takeing it's riſe from an inordinate, and ſinful, love of the World, and is, therefore, corrigible by the ordinary influences of Grace, denied in ſuch caſe, to none who ſeek it; while the difficulty, or, to ſpeak more properly, impoſſibility, as before explain'd, of receiving the other, proceeds, not from Sin, but from an inbred, and warrantable, deſire of procreation, and which therefore, conſider'd in it ſelf, within its due bounds, the generality of Men have no grace given them to controul. So that the univerſal latitude of

a Matt. 19. 23. *b* Matt. 19. 21.

the

the poſſibility of the *one* do's by no means infer the ſame extent of the poſſibility of the *other*.

After having ſtay'd thus long (to great purpoſe) *upon this general offer*, as he falſly conceiv'd, *of the gift of Continency on God's part*; He ſquanders away the reſt of the page upon a lamentable complaint of a diſmal conſequence, he knows of, that attends the contrary opinion; and that is the diſcouragement it ſuggeſts from attempting the ſingle condition of life. But will my Author impartially ſet the conſequences that wait upon *our* opinion, with thoſe that follow from his *own*? The worſt that can be ſaid of ours, ſhould it prove falſe, is, that it allows not the ſcope and encouragement to the *Celibate*, which it ought, and ſo robs the Church of the credit of perhaps a great number of Votaries; but yet entails no Sin upon thoſe who act upon ſuch ſuppoſition; it remains ſtill lawful for thoſe, in the conceſſion of my Author himſelf, who are actually poſſeſs'd of the gift of Continency, to Marry, and much more for thoſe, who are only Candidates for it. But now the contrary opinion of the univerſality of the gift, upon which the Laws of perpetual *Celibacy* are grounded, if falſe, infallibly expoſes thouſands to an apparent deſtruction, puts them upon a ſinful tempting of God, and miſerably lays them open to the reſtleſs temptations of the Devil. And, if we may judge of the falſhood of the *Hypotheſis*, by the fatal and numerous miſcarriages of thoſe, who act upon it, we have all the reaſon in the World to believe it one of the moſt dangerous and deſtructive opinions to the Souls of Men, that the ſophiſtry of the infernal Spirit has hitherto put upon them.

§. 16. p. 12. Par. 10.

There remains but one hint more worth remark in this tedious paragraph; and that is his extremly ignorant,

ignorant, or confident, offer, to insinuate his opinion of the universal possibility of this gift, from the Apostle's *leaving* [a] *wives* amongst the rest, (admitting that word to be understood of *a local separation*) *and following Christ*. An admirable art of reasoning certainly this Man's, which teaches him to argue from a very few *particulars* to an *universal*, from an *extraordinary* case and assistance to *ordinary*, from grace to contain confer'd in case of abstinence *impos'd by God*, to the like expectation of it in that, which we rashly and unwarrantably *impose upon our selves*.

6. And thus, for ought we yet see, have not all the united forces of his reason been able to prove the universality of this gift.

§. 17. And I think we have less cause to fear, (which is) the next thing to be consider'd, that he can ever bribe the Scriptures to second him in the attempt. The topping text of the party, a text so frequently press'd by my Author, that one would imagin he wrote his whole book for the sake of it, is that of St. [b] *Paul*, where he tells us, that the young Widdows, who had Married after their dedication to the Churches service, *had damnation for casting off their first Faith*, which he could

Par. 14. not have said *if God had not given them power of observing their vow; but should rather have allow'd, their remarrying, and blam'd their vowing.* 'Tis answer'd that supposing St. *Paul* to have blam'd these Women for remarrying, upon this ground, that God had given them grace to contain; my *Discourser* must new model all the *Rules of Logic*, before he can thence infer the universal possibility of the gift. For why, of unnecessaries, may not God give to one, what he will deny to another? as has been already abundant-

[a] Luke 18. 28, 29. [b] 1 Tim. 5. 11, 12.

ly

ly evinc'd: and therefore, tho' it be granted, that they Married out of pure *Wantonneſs*, when they had ability to contain, yet how do's it follow but that others Marry out of meer *neceſſity?*

And tho' this be a ſufficient anſwer to the argument, He has fram'd from this celebrated text; yet, 2*dly*, is the Apoſtle ſo far from *diſallowing their remarrying*, as my Author pretends, that he plainly adviſes it v. 14. expounded of ſuch votaries (if I may call them ſo) by the Fathers themſelves[a], and that, not in compliance with their want of *will* as the Diſcourſer ſuppoſes, but *power*, to contain; for, otherwiſe, 'tis not reaſonable, to preſume he would ever have preſcribed this method of ſubduing their inclinations to thoſe already engag'd in the Churche's ſervice, and maintain'd by Her; but muſt rather, with my Author, have exhorted ſuch perſons at leaſt, who had already laid themſelves under an obligation, to an attainment of the gift, by prayer, faſting, and other caſtigations of the fleſh; howſoever he might for the future, (as we ſee he did) provide againſt the ſcandal of theſe infirmities of the fleſh, by a prohibition of admittance into the order under the age of ſixty. And yet, we ſee, He ſuggeſts nothing like it, but *will*, on the contrary, *that the younger Women* [amongſt the profeſs'd Widows, who had a mind to it] *Marry*, agreeable to his order con-

a Chryſoſt. in loc. and from him Theophylact, σεσιγημένως μὲν ἐβούλοντο ἀντὶ μὴ ἀθετῆσαι τὸν σύνδεσμον ἐγκαλεῖν· νῦν δὲ λοιπὸν τὸν γάμον, βούλομαι κἀγὼ, συγχωρῆσαι. Ambroſ. in loc. Quoniam quæ ſupra dixit de hujuſmodi contraria & illicita, perducunt eas ad mortem; idcirco conſilium dat & præcipit ea fieri *quæ licita ſunt*. Melius eſt enim domus ſuæ curam gerere quam in aliena domo adſtari, & multum expedit nubere, quam ſub bona & pia profeſſione notabiliter incedere. Auguſt. l. de agone Chriſtiano c. 31. Sunt qui viduas, ſi nupſerint, tanquam adulteras damnant, & ſuper doctrinam Apoſtolicam ſe prædicant eſſe mundiores. Qui nomen ſuum ſi vellent agnoſcere; *mundanos* ſe potius quam *mundos* vocarent. Nam viduas ſuas uri cogunt, quas nubere non permittunt; non enim prudentiores habendi ſunt quam Paulus Apoſtolus, qui ait, malo eas nubere, quam uri.

cerning Widows in general in the 7. of the [a] *Corinthians*, *if they contain not, let them* [not ſtruggle with God for the gift of continency, but] *Marry.* 3*dly* Therefore, we muſt certainly ſeek farther for what the Apoſtle reprehends in theſe perſons; and it ſeems to me to be this; firſt, the motive to their Marriage, their light and *wanton* humor, expreſs'd in the 11*th* verſe; and then, 2*dly*, the conſequence, that frequently attended it, their renouncing their *firſt Faith* properly ſo call'd; *i. e.* [b] their Chriſtianity, expreſs'd in the 12*th*. For matching many times with Infidels, or Jews, they frequently came to throw off their office and religion together. Hence I preſume, it is, that the Apoſtle limits the liberty, he gives Widows to Marry, to their Marrying [c] *only in the Lord*: i. e. in the expoſition of the Fathers to Converts to the Chriſtian Faith; and the wiſdom of the following Ages of the Church, was not deſtitute of proviſions in relation to this matter. 4*thly*, and laſtly, ſuppoſing them culpable for their remarrying, abſtracted from the conſiderations now mention'd, yet certainly muſt he be underſtood to have had an eye likewiſe to the *occaſion*, they gave of bringing a ſcandal upon the Church, by departing from their engagements, and the raſhneſs and inconſideratneſs of their entring upon them. Hence ſay *Chryſoſtom* [d] and *Theophylact* upon their remarrying, that they did not ſoberly and judiciouſly make choice of their State. And the Author of the Conſtitutions aſcribed to St. *Clement* has ſo particularly ſtated this matter, that I ſhall not grudg to tranſlate Him. *But if ye admit a younger Woman into*

[a] 1 Ep. v. 9.

[b] See Bp. Jewell's Def. of his Apol. *part* 2. *pag.* 176. Chemnit. Examen. *part.* 3. *cap.* 9. Bp. Hall's Honor of the marryed Clergy *lib.* 1. *Sect.* 6. They that prefer the common interpretation may find an anſwer fram'd according to it in the late excellent London-Treatiſe of Celibacy *pag.* 42.

[c] 1 Cor. 7. 39.

[d] Ἀναῦρ ἐν ὑβρίσῃ, ὅτι γαμεῖται ἔλαττον. ὁ γὰρ ἕλκετο τὴν γαμετὴν μετὰ χρείας μετὰ χρείας λογισμῶν.

the

the order of Widow-hood, and ſhe, not bearing it in her youth, go and Marry, ſhe will do a thing unbecoming the glory of Chriſt, and retract her promiſe to God, not becauſe ſhe marrys again, but that ſhe has not kept her promiſe, growing wanton againſt Chriſt, becauſe ſhe came not in Faith and in the fear of God to the performance of her promiſe, wherefore we ought not raſhly, but cautiouſly, to make them. §. 18.

2*dly*, Argues the Diſcourſer, *Neither would our Savior have recommended the like reſolution and attempt in thoſe, who, he ſaith,* „ *made themſelves Eunuchs for the Kingdom of Heaven*, Mat. 19. 12. *If he would not alſo be aſſiſtant to them with his grace; as he approv'd their purpoſe and deſign.* Very well! But, firſt, where meets he with the great *recommendations* and *encomiums* of thoſe voluntary Eunuchs he ſpeaks of? Our Savior ſays, in the [a] place, he quotes, that *there are ſuch;* and adviſes them to continue ſo rather than to Marry; but I find nothing of the mighty panegyric, my Author promis'd us in all this. But, 2*dly*, the poor Man has miſerably dropt the queſtion in his rapturous fit of admiring this *happier condition*; for we doubt not, but that God [b] *will aſſiſt thoſe with his Grace, who make themſelves Eunuchs for the Kingdom of Heaven*, i. e. all thoſe, to whom he gives the gift; but then the queſtion is behind ſtill whether this gift be univerſal or no; which we deny, and he has not prov'd. The remaining part of this paragraph has been anſwer'd already; and I ſee no obligation, I have to dance after him in all his notorious tautologies. Par. 11. See §. 8.

3*dly*, *Neither would St. Paul have approv'd the ſame reſolution in thoſe, who could maſter ſo far their own will, unleſs*, unleſs what? unleſs every one could attain the

a Matt. 19. v. 12. b Matt. 19. v. 11. compared with v. 12.

ſame maſtery over their wills, for that's the point in hand, would he not approve it? 'Tis plain the Reaſon
Par. 16. lyes on the contrary ſide, and that all can not maſter them. But, *he would much more have approv'd this victory over natural inclinations, in the Virgin than in the Father, who might be neceſſitated to go againſt his will, by the incontinacibility* (or, *honorificabilitudinitatibus*) *of the Virgin.* And what then? Juſt nothing. Well, but *the need of Marriage to ſome* mention'd 1 *Cor.* 7. *v.* 36. *is not neceſſity abſolute, as appears by what follows: do what He will, the other doing better.* But, firſt, ſhould we grant that the Virgins, the Apoſtle ſpeaks of, lay not under any abſolute neceſſity of marriage, yet why may not others? Secondly, 'tis highly probable they did, why elſe ſhould the Apoſtle have adviſ'd their parents rather to Marry them, eſpecially in thoſe afflicted times, which yet he does in thoſe very words [*do what he will*] i. e. what he intended, which was the Marrying of them [a], whereby this miſtaken man thinks he left it indifferent to them under thoſe circumſtances. Thirdly, 'tis farther to be obſerv'd, that the *need* expreſs'd in this *v.* is explain'd by ἀνάγκη, *neceſſity*, without any limitation, in the next, and laſtly, that *the doing better* v. 38. is not ſaid of *giving her in marriage*, who had *need* of it, *v.* 36. as this Sophiſter would put upon us; but of Her, who lay under no ſuch *neceſſity* of it, *v.* 37 [b]. Thus wiſely do's my Author affect brevity, when he finds his Argument will not bear a diſtinct view.

§. 19. Par. 25. But becauſe we are upon the Chapter of Scripture in relation to the extent of this gift, we will here ſee,

[a] See Theophyl. in loc. Det eam nuptum; Grot. in loc.

[b] Hoc dicit, ut qui virginem habet, cui animus ad nuptias non eſt, ſervet illam; nec illi ingerat fomitem nuptiarum, quam videt nubendi voluntatem non habere. Ambroſ. in loc.

(what

(what the Diſcourſer has attempted in a remote paragraph) whether He be any more ſucceſsful in eluding thoſe Scriptures, we alledg for its being *particular*, than he has been in thoſe, whereby he would have prov'd *it univerſal*, that ſo the Reader may have this whole argument under his view at once.

The Texts, we alledg are known to be theſe, firſt, the anſwer of our [a] Savior to his Diſciples, who, upon his ſtateing the bond of Marriage indiſſoluble, unleſs upon cauſe of Fornication, replied, that it was better then for a Man not to Marry; to whom he ſubjoyns: *All men receive not this ſaying* of living ſingle, *ſave they to whom it is given.* Secondly, that of St. [b] *Paul*, where, ſpeaking expreſsly of the difference of Mens abilities and graces in relation to the Conjugal and Virginal ſtate, He affirms, *that every man has his proper gift of God;* and in [c] another verſe of the ſame Chapter, that there was a *neceſsity* upon ſome parents *to give their Virgins*, or daughters, *in marriage;* juſt now conſider'd. To theſe the ſumm of the Diſcourſer's anſwer is this, that, what our Savior and St. *Paul* here affirm, relates only to *the great ſtrength of the temptations of Luſt, beyond all other: to the great impediments in ſome, more than in others, ariſing from natural temper, age, condition of life, former habits*, &c. *and from moſt mens averſneſs to undergo thoſe rigors and mortifications, which procure and preſerve continency* &c. but not to the denyal of ſufficient grace to conquer, and ſubdue them all. This is the ſumm total of what he has filled three whole pages with; and the Reply may ly within the ſame compaſs of lines with the ſubſtance of his anſwer. 'Tis true then that God denies none ſufficient Grace againſt inducements *to Sin*, from theſe temptations and

[a] Matt. 19. 9, 10, 11, 12. [b] 1 Cor. 7. 7. [c] v. 36.

paſſions, but not againſt inducements *to marriage* from them. 'Tis abſolutely neceſſary, in the one caſe, for the attainment of Salvation, and therefore denied to none, not ſo in the other, and therefore granted to few. The firſt impreſſions of Grace upon the will are never wanting to any Man in relation to his acquiſition of whatſoever is requiſite to that great end, and are never withdrawn but upon his abuſe of them; as my Author has very induſtriouſly ſhown to no purpoſe for a
p. 34. whole page together; but here then lyes his fatal miſtake, that he did conſider, that the firſt motions of Grace, (without which Men cannot ſtirr of themſelves) towards to the attainment of things of an unneceſſary nature, as continency on all hands is granted to be, are not univerſally beſtow'd, and, conſequently, the gift by no means univerſally acquirable. And this is indeed what the Diſcourſer, after having vex'd his thoughts upon this Argument, happily ſtumbles upon p. 35. and would gladly ſham off by humbly *conceiving* we do'nt ſtate the matter ſo: in anſwer to which I as humbly beg his pardon. But once more yet He call's in the ſtale *ſalvo* of the councel of perfection to his aid; and will, think we, God any more deny the firſt influences of his grace in order to the arriving at the perfection, he adviſes, than he will for performing the duties he commands? 'Tis anſwer'd briefly, that the duties he commands, he commands all Men, to whom therefore he will never be wanting in the firſt illapſes of his grace for their performance of them; the perfection he adviſes being only this, that he, who has the gift to live ſingle, rather make uſe of it, than Marry, (as I have told him already more than once)
See § 8. He adviſes only to thoſe who are [a] *able to receive it*,

[a] Matt. 19. 11, 12.

or

or as explain'd in the preceding v. *to whom it is given to live* ſingle, by enjoying and improving the firſt influxes of his grace in this kind, not common to all Men. And indeed our Savior's anſwer to his Diſciples had not been full and ſatisfactory taken in any other ſence. For if God did really extend the firſt tenders of his grace univerſally to all Men, and they only fail'd of attaining the gift, through their own default, it could ſtill have remain'd true, that *it was better,* then, *not to marry;* in as much as it was better ſtill to cloſe with God's offer of this Grace, notwithſtanding the difficulty of the attempt, (which would ſtill be alleviated by the farther aſſiſtances of his concurrent Grace) than to labour under the accidental inconveniences of Marriage, as our ſavior had ſtated it indiſſoluble, and therefore, the *power to contain*, as my Author argues, *is* P. 33. *given to any, who uſe the means, to ſubdue their paſſions &c.* yet here lies his miſtake, that he did not conſider, that the power to ſubdue their paſſions, ſo far as to make them not ſtand in need of marriage, is not given to all Men; not only through their neglect of cultivating and improving grace already beſtow'd, but becauſe the generality of them never had it beſtow'd upon them at all, as a thing no way requiſite to their Salvation. I ſhall not ſtay to make any farther application of what has been ſaid to the particulars of his diſcourſe upon this Argument; if the Reader pleaſes only to carry thus much along with him, the fallacious impertinence of what he has ſpun out to the length of two leaves diſcovers its ſelf upon ordinary attention. And now ſince he has done with theſe texts, I ſhall crave leave to take them up after Him, and becauſe the voice of God, howſoever clear and expreſs, is, in ſome Men's

eſtimate, thought, like their own Prayers in an unknown tongue, to give but an uncertain ſound without the voice of Men to determine its ſignification; I ſhall briefly ſhew, that the Fathers themſelves, as from the words of our Saviour expreſsly, ſo likewiſe with a regard to them in all probability, make continency a particular, not a common talent.

The Diſcourſer has been [a] already told of the conceſſion, made by *Maldonate*, not only of the general ſtream of interpreters, but of three of that venerable number, *Origen*, *Nazianzen*, and *Ambroſe*; to whom he adds [b] *Auſtin*, in the following page, and yet, at the ſame time, like one blunder'd betwixt obſtinacy and conviction, makes him ſtand alone in that opinion. To theſe I muſt add *Cyprian*, *Hilary*, *Gregory* the great, and even St. *Jerom* himſelf, as elſewhere, ſo particularly in his very comment upon this place. All which teſtimonies I ſhall, in the laſt place, ſhut up, with §. 20, 21, 22. 26. thoſe of three conſiderable Councils, held at *Ancyra*, *Gangra*, and *Nice*, whoſe ſentiments in this matter we ſhall ſee by and by.

[a] Anſwer to Conſiderations on the Spirit of Martin Luther. p. 19.

[b] Qui poteſt capere capiat; *quod non omnes capiunt*, ergo *qui poteſt*, capiat, *quod non omnes capiunt*; poſſunt autem capere, quibus hoc præſtat miſericordia Dei *occulta*, ſed non injuſta. *Auguſt* l. 2. de adulterinis conjugiis, c. 8. Et de bono viduitatis c. 9. Sed quoniam, ſicut ait Dominus, non omnes capiunt verbum hoc, *quæ poteſt* ergo capere, capiat, quæ ſe non continet, nubat. Si autem perſeverare nolint, aut *non poſſint*, melius eſt ut nubant &c. *C pr. ep.* ad *Pompon.* 62. Cui (ei qui ſe caſtraverit propter regnum cœlorum) nos quoque ſimiles effici, *ſi tamen poſſimus*, admonuit. Hilar. in loc. Quod eo innotuit ſummum eſſe, quo *denegavit omnium*, Gregor. in paſtorali, parte tertia, admon. 39. *Si omnes virgines eſſe poſſint*, hunquam Dominus diceret, qui poteſt capere capiat, & Apoſtolus in ſuadendo non trepidaret. Hiero. adv. Jovin. l. 1. p 412. & in loc. Unde (ex eo ſcil quod nullus Eunuchorum conſequitur regnum cœlorum, niſi qui ſe caſtraverit propter Chriſtum) infert Dominus, qui poteſt capere capiat; ut unuſquiſque conſideret vires ſuas; *utrum poſſit* virginalia pudicitiæ præcepta implere; per ſe enim caſtitas blanda eſt, & quemlibet ad ſe alliciens; *ſed conſideranda ſunt vires, ut qui poteſt capere capiat.* To whom I ſhall add *Cajetan* one of the beſt writers of their own Church. Non dicit, qui *vult*, ſed qui *poteſt* (capere capiat) quia & ſi velles, & non ſentis te tantæ conſtantiæ ut poſſis capere tantæ perfectionis munus, non es de numero eorum qui poſſunt capere. in loc.

As

As to the other text, of St. *Paul*, in the *7th* of the *Corinthians*, where, ſpeaking of theſe two different ſtates, He affirms in reference to them, *that every man hath his proper gift of God*, I deſire only it may be conſider'd with relation to its context for its expoſition. The Apoſtle then, in the ſame verſe, wiſhing that *all men were even as He Himſelf*, i. e. did contain, as he did, rather than, at that juncture, Marry; in the following words, now before us, accounts for the difference obſervable amongſt them as to this matter; which, if it be, what this Diſcourſer pretends, only this, that ſome Men will uſe the means for attaining continency, others not, I would deſire to know, why then do's the Apoſtle aſcribe it to their having, or not [a] having the gift, and not rather to their reſpective cultivateing, or neglect of it; which he do's not in the leaſt ſuggeſt.

We come now, in the next place, to conſider our Author's argument for the univerſality of the gift of continency, from *the prohibitions and practice of Antiquity*, in which he is confident of ſo great an advantage over us, *that nothing, he thinks, can be replied to* the inſtances he alleges. Now tho' the cauſe do not depend upon any Autority purely humane, but upon the Scripture, and Reaſon, with which it is ſeconded, yet I doubt not but, after an impartial examination of the ſeveral Canons he has produc'd, and ſome obſervations upon them, in which method he has led me the way, the Cauſe of his Church will be found to ſuffer conſiderably more by the attempt than ours. I ſhall examin them in that order, in which he has huddled them up, and endeavour to place them §. 20.

[a] Quamvis ego vellem omnes Homines eſſe inconjugatos, tamen ſcio non eſſe commune tantum donum omnibus, ſed unuſquiſque &c. — unus donum caſtitatis conjugalis, alius virgineæ &c. Cajet. in loc.

in that true light, which he ſeems, to have induſtriouſly diſſembled.

He ſets forward from the 27*th*, or, as others, the 26*th* of thoſe Canons, call'd Apoſtolical: *Ex iis qui non ducta uxore ad Clerum promoti ſunt, jubemus, ſi velint, uxorem ducere, Lectores & Cantores ſolos.* Which manifeſtly imports that all orders of the Clergy, from the higheſt to the loweſt, might Marry before, Readers and Singers only after, they enter'd upon their function; as is evident, as well from the plain words of the text, as from the Commentaries of *Balſamon* and *Zonaras* upon it, which my Author may at his leiſure reconcile with the preſent practice and conſtitution of the Church of *Rome* in this particular; as likewiſe the Canon that precedes it, which orders the depoſition of a Biſhop, Prieſt, or Deacon, for the cauſe of Fornication.

The next he mentions is the tenth Canon of the Council of *Ancyra*. *Quicunque Diaconi conſtituti, in ipſa ordinatione proteſtati ſunt, & dixerunt, oportere ſe uxores ducere, cum non poſſunt ſic manere: ii ſi uxorem poſtea duxerint, ſint in miniſterio, eo quod hoc ſit illis ab Epiſcopo conceſſum, ſi qui autem, hoc ſilentio præterito, & in ordinatione ut ita manerent, ſuſcepti ſunt, poſtea autem ad matrimonium venerunt, ii a diaconatu ceſſent.* Where we find, not Readers and Singers only, as in the preceding Canon, but Deacons likewiſe, allow'd the liberty of Marriage after Ordination, (as all ranks of the Clergy were allow'd it before) only upon this eaſy condition of proteſting their *inability* to contain, at the time of their going into Orders. And is not this an admirable Canon in favour of that Celibacy, which is commanded in the Church of *Rome*? a Man would be tempted to

to think the Author wrote this ſhortly after his revolt, and ſo miſtook his Party. *Baronius* and *Binius*, I am ſure, took a great deal of pains to elude the force of it, conceiving it to make too much for the Proteſtants. My Author makes only this remark upon it, in countenance of the general argument of his book, but without the leaſt aim at a proof of his aſſertion, that *poſſe* here is to be taken, as explain'd in his 24 Paragraph, that is, for want of will to ſubdue their paſſions, and the temptations that court them; and ſo the Fathers of this Council muſt be ſuppos'd to have allow'd the Deacons liberty to Marry after Ordination, for this weighty reaſon, that they would not give themſelves the trouble of containing, and in conſequence of this deſign, I preſume, it is, that the Author thought fit to make uſe of *Iſidore Mercator's* Verſion of the Canon, who renders the original χρῆναι γαμῆσαι by *velle ſe uxores habere*, that they *would have* Wives; whereas the plain unperverted meaning of it is, that they *ought to have* them, becauſe they had declar'd they *could not* contain.

The next he alledges is the firſt Canon of the Council of Neocæſarea *Presbyter ſi uxorem duxerit ordine ſuo moveatur:* If a Presbyter Marry, that is, after he has taken upon him the order of the Presbytery (πρεσβύτερος ἐαν γήμῃ) He is to be depos'd; an evident argument, firſt, that it was the practice of thoſe days for Presbyters to Marry after Ordination; for why elſe ſhould this Canon prohibit it? and ſecondly, that they might ſtill retain and aſſociate with thoſe Wives they had Married before Ordination, and what is this to the preſent Roman conſtitution? eſpecially when it is conſider'd that the ſequel of the ſame Canon provides,

that a Presbyter for Fornication, or Adultery, ſhall not only be depos'd, but be expell'd the Communion of the Church, and undergoe the rigorous puniſhments of the Chriſtian penitents; wiſely diſcouraging lewdneſs in the Clergy, whilſt they ſet limits to their lawful enjoyments. For it ſeems t'was no current doctrine in thoſe days, that t'was more pardonable in a Prieſt to commit Fornication than Matrimony.

§. 21. His fourth aſſault is made from no leſs Autority than a Canon of a general and very venerable Council, the third of the firſt of *Nice*; which being back'd with his own profound reaſoning upon it, will perhaps ſeem to require a more particular examination. The Canon is thus: *Vetuit magna Synodus omnino, ne liceat Epiſcopo, nec Presbytero, nec Diacono, nec ulli penitus eorum qui ſunt in Clero, introductam habere Mulierem, præterquam utique matrem, vel ſororem, vel amitam, vel eas ſolas perſonas quæ omnem ſuſpicionem effugiunt.* For the right underſtanding whereof, and diſpelling that miſt, this Author has rais'd about it, it will be neceſſary only briefly to remark who theſe συνείσακτοι, or *introductæ mulieres* were, of which the Canon ſpeaks. And that they were only ſuch as being devoted to Virginity themſelves, cohabited with the unmarryed Clergy, is ſo demonſtrably evident, beſides other teſtimonies, from St. [a] *Chryſoſtom's* oration to thoſe who entertain'd them, and from the *ſcholia* of *Balſamon* [b] upon St. *Baſil's* Epiſtle to *Gregory*, or, as others, *Paregorius*, the Presbyter, who kept one of them in

a Εἰσὶ γὸ τινες οἱ γαμῶ ἢ συνοσίας χωρὶς κόρας ἀπεφοιτήκασιν ἀγνώτους &c.

b Συνεισάκτους Νίλος ὁ ἁγιὸς, ὃς φησὶν ἐπὶ τῶν ἱερωμένων συνόδων, τὰς οἱ κανονικὰς ἱερωμένας ἀζύγους συνεισαγομένας ἢ κανονικὸς τῶν ἀντοῖς. and ſo Matthæus Monachus, or Blaſtares, in his matrimonial caſes, c. 19. ſpeaking of Biſhops, or others of the Clergy, who retain'd theſe συνείσακτοι, after having cited this Canon, adds, συνεισάκτους δὲ φησι γαμέτας συνοικεῖν ἱερεῦσιν ἀζύγοις &c.

his

his Houſe; that if this Author had duly and impartially conſider'd this point of Antiquity, he muſt needs have dropt this Canon and his argument together. For it being undeniably evident, as well from the teſtimonies here alledg'd, as from the univerſal vote of this Council, upon the motion of *Paphnutius*, that the Clergy might retain the Wives, they had Marryed before Ordination, which my Author himſelf, in the very ſame page, has not the confidence to deny, 'tis more than ridiculous to urge againſt the credibility of their having Wives, that there had then been no cauſe p. 15. of that ſuſpition, the Canon ſuggeſts from their cohabiting with the συνείσακτοι; for the Canon relates not to the marryed, but to the unmarryed Clergy, who entertain'd that ſort of Women, and, thereupon, fell under ſuſpition of diſhoneſty: or, that *it had been unreaſonable and unſafe, to have depriv'd their Wives of all Women-attendance and ſociety*; for, again, the Canon concerns not them, who had Wives; nor does the word συνείσακτος comprehend all ſorts of *Female attendants, or ſociety*, as my Author, to countenance his argument, and by uſing the Verſion which renders it by the general term of *mulier extranea*, ſeems fondly to imagin; but ſuch only, as the ſingle Clergy adopted, as it were under the Character of *Siſters*, [a] or *beloved*, for the ſake of ſociety, and mutual converſation, which extended even as far as bedding together, tho', as both parties made frequent proteſtations, without the leaſt violation of their chaſtity. And now, I think, I may ſafely diſmiſs this particular with this one remarque more; that if a voluntary, but intemperate, zeal for continency did, in thoſe days of greater ſanctity, draw

[a] Valeſius in his Learned Notes upon Euſebius his Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory l. 7. c. 30. tells us, that the preſent Canon is inſcribed in an old Code at Corby, de *ſubintroductis, id eſt, adoptivis ſororibus*.

along with it a practice of ſo great [a] ſcandal, and pernicious example, which occaſion'd this and ſeveral other Canons, Antiquity made againſt it, we cannot but, in theſe dregs of times, expect that a much more ſtrict, and forc'd Celibacy in the Clergy muſt needs be attended with more fatal and deſtructive conſequents.

As for the ſtory of Paphnutius in this Council, which, my Author ſays, *makes ſo great a noiſe amongſt us*, I do not find that either he, or the Champions of his cauſe, *Baronius*, and *Bellarmin* &c- have yet been able, with all their zealous endeavours, to ſtifle it. The ſtory is, in ſhort, this; [b] (for, ſince he has mention'd it, I ſhall not content my ſelf with his lame and imperfect relation of it;) that, motion being made by ſome Biſhops in the Council to introduce *a new Law* into the Church, whereby the Married Biſhops, Preſbyters, and Deacons, ſhould, after Ordination, ſeperate from their Wives they had Marryed before; *Paphnutius* riſing up, did vehemently declare againſt it, alleging that *ſo heavy a yoke* ought not to be impoſed upon the Clergy: *Marriage being honourable, and a bed undefil'd*, leaſt they ſhould rather injure than edify the Church by ſo ſevere a prohibition (and let experience ſpeak the truth of his prediction) for that all Men [c] *could not* put off their natural paſſions and inclinations; ſtileing the uſe of a lawful Wife *chaſtity*, and urging farther againſt ſuch ſeparation, (as *Gelaſius* adds, in his ſecond book of the Acts of this Council,) this text, that, *what God had joyn'd no Man ought to put a ſunder*, and that, the chaſtity of Wives ſo ſeparated might hereby likewiſe be endanger'd, and,

[a] Quando etſi ſtuprum eorum conſcientiæ dent, hoc ipſum grande crimen eſt, quod illorum ſcandalo in aliorum ruinas exempla naſcantur. Cypr. ep. 7.

[b] Socrat. Hiſt. Eccleſ. l. 1. c. 11. Sozomen l. 1. c. 23. edit. Vales.

[c] ὑ γὰρ πάντας δύνασθαι φέρειν τῆς ἀσκήσεως τὴν ἄσκησιν.

that,

that, therefore he thought it *ſufficient*, that, according to the ancient tradition of the Church, the Clergy ſhould not Marry after Orders, but yet that none ſhould be oblig'd to ſeperate from the Wives they had Marryed before. To which inſtance of his the whole Council unanimouſly conſented, leaving every Man to his liberty in this matter. After which impartial relation of the paſſage, I cannot but again reflect upon the diſingenuity of this Author, firſt, in ſlurring over the weighty and unanſwerable reaſons of *Paphnutius* with the mention of a *grave jugum*, and an *&c.* conveniently tack'd to it. Secondly, in not acquainting his Reader with the determination of the Council upon the motion of that venerable perſon, but leaving the matter undecided, as his private opinion only. Thirdly in that empty triumph of his, in the concluſion of this ſtory, wherein he tacitly taxes the Reform'd Writers of inſincerity, in citeing this Hiſtory in behalf of the Marriage of the Clergy after holy Orders; which I defy him to ſhow either in *Calvin*, whom he mentions, or any of our Writers. Fourthly, in that falſe and frivolous boaſt of his, that this ſingle inſtance of *Paphnutius*, *ſtands for a bulwark againſt all the other evidence in this point of Antiquity*. For in what point do's he mean? if in that of Marrying after Orders, 'tis a moſt falſe ſuggeſtion that we pretend to any ſuch thing from it; if before, then, as has in ſome meaſure already, and will ſtill farther appear, we have not only this oecumenical Council, but abundant others on our ſide. My Author has dropt one expreſſion in proof, I preſume, of the indifferency of *Paphnutius*, as to the Marriage of the Clergy, which 'tis pitty to diſſemble the force of, and that is, that he himſelf was *never Marryed*. And therefore

fore doubtleſs his teſtimony and opinion in this caſe the leſs conſiderable. Admirable! But turn the tables only, and ſuppoſe him Marryed, or addicted to the more venial Sin of Fornication. I doubt not but we ſhould have been run out of breath with a parentheſis of half a ſpans length to have ſhewn, upon that ſcore, the invalidity of his opinion. And can any Man of the common make of underſtandings doubt, but that the extraordinary and celebrated continency of this excellent perſon, to which I might juſtly add thoſe other ſupernatural qualifications, the working of Miracles [a] *&c.* which make up the reſt of his character, as they give credit to the cauſe we maintain, ſo likewiſe force and vigor to the arguments he produces in favour of it. For can any thing be more cogent, than that he, who was endow'd with the gift of Continency in ſo emiminent a degree, ſhould yet, in the Spirit of an Apoſtle, declare himſelf ſenſible of the inability of all Men *to be as he was?* and indeed 'tis obvious to reflect upon that warm [b] concern he expreſs'd, and the force of the reaſonings he us'd in defence of the Clergy's retaining thoſe Wives they had Marryed before Ordination, (and which do, as ſtrongly conclude for their Marriage in general) and the coolneſs of his expreſſions in relation to the traditionary practice of the Church, that they ſhould not Marry after; for here he ſays only that it was *ſufficient* [c] to obſerve it. Whereas in the former caſe he alleges the Scriptures ſpeaking lowdly on his ſide; a plain indication, that he thought his arguments, on the one ſide, concluſive, and *connived at*, rather than approv'd, the practice of the Church, on the other.

a Socrates loco ſupra citat.

b Ἐβόα, μακρά &c.

c Ἀρκεῖσθαι τε τὸν φθάσαντα κληροῦ τυχεῖν &c.

In

In recounting this ſtory of the excellent *Paphnutius* §. 22.
my Author has, indeed unluckily mention'd, but yet wiſely hudled up, and ſlurr'd over two Canons of two ſeveral Councils as if he would be thought to be Conſcious, that they made much more to his Adverſarie's purpoſe, than his own. The firſt of them (for I am forc'd to attend him back again to the goale from whence we ſtarted) is the fifth of thoſe ſtiled Apoſtolical. *Epiſcopus, vel Presbyter, vel Diaconus uxorem ſuam ne ejiciat religionis prætextu ſin autem ejecerit, ſegregetur, & ſi perſeveret, deponatur*: for it was, it ſeems, the practice of ſeveral of the Clergy, in that, and after ages of the Church, to put away their Wives at their pleaſure, upon a pretence of a more intire devoting of themſelves to the miniſtry of the Church, thereby reproaching the conjugal ſtate as inconſiſtent with true purity and holyneſs of life. Which practice the Church thought fit, by this Canon, to obviate, as likewiſe, conſequently, the falſe notion, upon which it was built, the impurity [a] of the Matrimonial bed; which being ſtill the See §. 27.
prime and fundamental reaſon of the injunction of Celibacy to the Clergy, the Author, or Authors, of theſe Canons, as far as their Autority reaches, have ſufficiently confuted, and conſequently, the Law of Celibacy it ſelf, on which it is ultimately grounded: and upon what reaſons ſoever (which ſhall afterwards be examin'd) the Church generally thought fit to prohibit Marriage to the Clergy after Orders, tis moſt certain, the Authors of theſe Canons, if conſiſtent with themſelves,

a Ἔοικε γὰρ εἰς διαβολὴν εἶναι τοῦτο τοῦ γάμου, ὡς ἀκαθαρτίαν τῆς μίξεως ἐμποιούσης. And Blaſtares in his Matrimonial tracts, c. 16. after having recited this Canon, adds, ἔοικε γὰρ τὸν γάμον διαβάλλειν ὡς ἀκάθαρτον ὃν τὸ νομίμως μίγνυσθαι. and accordingly Joſephus the Ægyptian thus paraphraſtically expounds it. Non licebit Epiſcopo, & Presbytero, nec Diacono, uxorem ſuam domo ſua ejicere, ſub prætextu abſtinentiæ, ſive devotionis, *ac ſi exiſtimaret matrimonialem cum ea coitum impurum eſſe* &c. See Dr. Beverig annotat. in loc.

 could

could not prohibit it upon this. As for the trifling ſuggeſtion of my Author that ſome, (i. e. *Bellarmin*, and his followers,) think, this Canon provided for their maintenance only by their Husbands; beſides that it is abundantly confuted by what has been already ſaid, and quoted; I would deſire him only to reſolve me, whether he thinks the Clergy of thoſe days ſuch ridiculous Hypocrites, as to pretend religion for denying ſubſiſtence to their lawful Wives? whereas, on the other hand, there is a form or appearance of Godlineſs, in denying them the uſe of the bed, and, upon that ſcore, in putting them away.

The other Canon, he has thought fit to ſhut up in the incloſure of a parentheſis, is the fourth of the Council of *Gangra*. *Si quis de Presbytero conjugato* (or, *qui uxorem habet*) *contendat, non oportere eo ſacra celebrante oblationi communicare, anathema ſit.* The occaſion of which Canon, as likewiſe of convening the Council, was the Hereſy of *Euſtathius*, an *Armenian* Biſhop, a mighty Patron of the Celibacy, who carrying his averſion to the Marryed ſtate, ſo far as to pronounce it inconſiſtent with the Kingdom of Heaven (in which it will afterwards appear, *Siricius* and others of the Roman Church have equal'd him) forbad all his followers to Communicate from the hands of a Marryed Presbyter, (juſt as *Hildebrand*, Biſhop of *Rome*, did after him, and who, for the ſame crime, had he liv'd in thoſe days, would, I doubt not, have been involv'd in the ſame *anathema* with him) But my Author has a cavil, borrow'd from *Bellarmin*, by which he means ſomething, if a Man knew but what; *here*, ſays he, *'tis habuit, non habet* (i. e. *uxorem*) here? where? I know *Dionyſius Exiguus* has ſo render'd it, but what then? do's the word γεγαμηκὼς ſignify him only,

See §. 27.

only, who has been Marryed, excluſively of him, who actually is ſo? Do's he think St. [a] *Paul*, from the Lord himſelf, commanded thoſe [τὰς γεγαμηκότας,] not to depart from each other, who had before left their Husbands or Wives? or, was no body ſo kind as to tell him, that [b] *Balſamon* in his *Scholia*, and *Ariſtenus* in his *Epitome*, expounds the Canon expreſsly of thoſe, who have Wives? or, that *Socrates* [c], relateing the ſtory, uſes the expreſſions of γεγαμηκὼς and γυναῖκα ἔχων indifferently for the ſame thing? and indeed what appearance of reaſon can any Man frame to himſelf, why *Euſtathius* his averſion ſhould be confin'd only to thoſe, who had been Marryed, and not rather extend it ſelf to thoſe who actually were in the ſtate? and therefore, I preſume, my Author, by his remark of *habuit not habet*, intended to inſinuate, that the Clergy were not allow'd Marriage at all at that time this Canon was made; tho' againſt the broadeſt conviction to the contrary; in conſequence whereof it is, that he tells us, in this looſe and general expreſſion, that the Canon was made againſt thoſe *who held it unlawful to receive the Communion from a Presbyter. formerly Marryed.* I have but two things more briefly to obſerve to him upon this Argument; the firſt is the conſequence that attended this affectation of Celibacy, which was no leſs than a general lewdneſs and debauchery amongſt them for want of ability to contain. The ſecond is how great a veneration the Fathers of this Council expreſs'd for the conjugal ſtate; as appears, firſt from the tenth Canon they made, whereby they anathematize thoſe, who being devoted to Virginity,

a 1 Cor. 7. 10.
b Ἀπὸ ἰμῶν ἐχόντων γυναῖκας. --- ἀπὸ ἀριστερῶν ὑποζυγίων.
c Hiſt. Eccleſ. l. 2. c 43.

ſhould exalt themſelves above their Marryed Brethren; and, ſecondly, from the concluſion of this Synod, wherein they declare, that, as they admire Virginity in conjunction with humility, ſo they *admit of the holy Matrimonial ſtate*. My Author's reading in the next advance ſeems to have run dregs, when he was forc'd to put ſuch ware upon us as the *Concilium Romanum*, generally ſuſpected; of whoſe Canons there are two Copies extant, but both ſo lame and disjoynted, that they are, in ſeveral places, paſt underſtanding, and yet, ſuch as they are, I can as little comprehend what advantage they bring to his cauſe. The ſeventh, which he cites, is no Law of Celibacy, but an injunction only to the ſub-Deacons not to Marry *after Orders;* as he may be ſufficiently convinc'd, if he pleaſe but to compare this with the nineteenth Canon of the ſame Synod; *Nemo Presbyter a die onus Presbyterii ſumat conjugium* &c. But this was conceiv'd in terms too plain for his uſe, who is ſenſible he ſhall profit moſt in the dark.

§. 23. But however unſucceſsful he has hitherto been, he ſeeems to promiſe himſelf no ſmall advantage againſt us, from the 33[d] Canon of the Conncil of *Eliberis* in *Spain;* ſince 'tis the only one (except the 3[d] of the firſt Council of *Nice*, wherein his reaſoning moſt wretchedly falter'd) that he has hitherto thought fit to argue upon. *Placuit in totum prohibere Epiſcopis, Preſbyteris, Diaconis, ac ſub-Diaconis, poſitis in miniſterio, abſtinere ſe a conjugibus ſuis & non generare filios: quod quicunque fecerit ab honore clericatus exterminetur*. Here, not to take advantage of the much different reading of *poſitis in Monaſterio* from *in miniſterio*, extant[a] in another Copy of the Canons of this

[a] See Binius, and others.

Council:

Council; I anſwer, that thoſe words do ſufficiently evince the meaning of the Canon to be only this, that the Clergy ſhould abſtain from their Wives during the turns or courſes of the adminiſtration of their office, or the more ſolemn part of it at leaſt, the celebration of the *Euchariſt*. For, firſt, as we ſhall ſee by and by, this was all the import of ſome Canons made, not long after, in other parts of the Weſtern Church. Secondly, he can never ſhow me any precedent, either of Rule or practice, of a total abſtinence of the Clergy from their Wives in any part of the Catholick Church before this, pretended, inſtance of the Council of *Eliberis*; which we cannot therefore reaſonably ſuſpect to have innovated in ſo weighty a matter. But, thirdly, other Canons of the ſame Council do evidently fix this meaning upon it. *Gratian* mentions one, not read in the collection of the reſt, which commands every Man to abſtain from his Wife three, four, or ſeven days before he receive the Communion, a plain interpretation of the Canon in debate; and the ſixty fifth commands the Clergy to caſt out their Wives from them, *a ſe projicere*, upon conviction of Adultery; which ſhows, that they then cohabited together, and were not oblig'd to a total abſtinence; which, whether voluntary, or forc'd, was, as the nature of the thing requir'd, allways attended with ſeparation. And indeed to what other purpoſe, than that, we contend for, can we imagin theſe *Spaniſh* Fathers to have ſuperadded theſe words, (*poſiti in miniſterio*) unleſs we will ſay they intend by them, (yet much more obſcure and unuſual) to expound the plain words of Biſhop, Presbyter, and Deacon, that preceded them? And now let my Author flouriſh with his *Canon, plainly ſhewing; that at that time in the Weſtern* §. 24.

Churches, not only Marriage after holy Orders was forborn, but abſtinence from their Wives, by thoſe, who were Marryed before, was commonly practic'd, which aſſertion I have ſhown to be falſe and groundleſs, as far as it pretends to the Autority of this Canon of the Council of *Eliberis*. Which, after all, did it ſpeak the ſence of my Author in this point, might not we juſtly take up the expoſtulation of [a] *Baronius* upon that unlucky 36*th* Canon that it made againſt the uſe of Images in Churches: *Anne potuit vel debuit decem & novem* (for there were no more in the whole Council) *Epiſcoporum conventus, in orbis angulo congregatus, aliud ſtatuiſſe quam ubique locorum univerſalis profiteretur eccleſia?* [b] *Ecquam tandem fidem meretur tam paucorum Epiſcoporum Canon quem totius eccleſiæ Catholicæ uſus contrarius continuo abolevit, imo antequam naſceretur, extinxit?* juſt as this Canon too was certainly aboliſh'd, did it mean what my Author would make it, by the ſubſequent contrary determination of the general Council of *Nice*.

§. 24. The next Canon under our conſideration is the ſecond of the ſecond Council of *Arles* which decrees that no Man ſhall be admitted into the Prieſthood, *in vinculo conjugii conſtitutus, niſi fuerit præmiſſa converſio.* Which I ſhall confront, in the firſt place, with the learned Biſhop *Hall's* anſwer (*Honour of the Maryed Clrgy l.* 2. §. 16.) that it is a groſs counterfeit: mentioning the *Arrians*, which were not yet hatch'd, *Bonoſus*, who liv'd long after in the time of *Innocent* the firſt, the *Concilium Vaſenſe*, which was yet later in the time of *Leo* the firſt. In the mean time, it was either before the Council of *Nice*, or after it; if before, it was corrected by the *Nicene*, if after, it was preſumtuous, in decreeing that peremptorily which the other

[a] An. 57. Num. 119. [b] Num. 122.

other left free. But not to ſtop here, the force of the Canon, I preſume, he conceives to be lodg'd (for 'tis harder many times to find out his meaning than to confute it) in the word *converſio*, which being applied to, and interpreted of, the Wife, makes the import of the Canon to be this, that no Man ſhall be Ordain'd Prieſt, whoſe Wife has not, before hand, lay'd her ſelf under the obligation of a Vow of Continency; for ſo they expound the word, which meaning 'tis indeed confeſs'd to have had in the latter ages of the Church, but do's not appear to have had it in this, at leaſt excluſively of thoſe in the conjugal ſtate in it's ſtricteſt notion. And that it bears a quite different ſignification in the place in diſpute, is evident from the third Canon of the ſame Council where the Clergy are allow'd to have *uxores converſæ* with them, a thing utterly inconſiſtent with thoſe, who had profeſs'd continency, who, as has already been obſerv'd, liv'd allways apart from their Husbands. The meaning of the Canon then is this: That he who is converted to the Chriſtian Faith, and his Wife ſtill an infidel, ſhall not take upon him the order of the Prieſthood, till ſhe be converted alſo; it being indeed prepoſterous for him to be admitted to the Miniſtry of the Church for the converſion of others, who has not yet been able to convert his own Family: juſt as the [a] Apoſtle ſeems to require that the Children of the Elders and the Wives of the Deacons be *faithful*. And agreeably hereunto we find the Fathers at *Carthage*, in the 39*th* Canon [b], decreeing, *that no Man be Ordain'd Biſhop, or Clerk, unleſs he have made all his Family Chriſtians, that none be ordain'd Biſhop, Preſbyter, or Dea-*

[a] Tit. 1. 6. 1 Tim. 3. 11.
[b] See the collection of 217. Canons of the Carthaginian Fathers Edit. Beverig.

con,

con, before they have made all, who live with them Orthodox Christians. And by this time I suppose it appears how strangely pertinent this Canon of the Council of *Arles* is to my Author's purpose. I give him in the blunder about the time wherein it was held; which was not under *Sylvester*, but *Siricius*; and proceed to the second Canon of the second Council of *Carthage*, as he calls it, (for there is great confusion in the order and time of these *African* Synods, wherein I am not concern'd) And that this Canon do's not enjoyn the Clergy totally to abstain from their Wives, which is the point he drives at, but only each of them during the course of their ministry, *in præstitutis uniuscujusque vicis diebus*, as *Balsamon* [a] translated speaks, will hence appear, first, *That it commands them no other continency, than what the Apostles taught and Antiquity had practis'd.* Now the Apostles never taught any other than a total refraining from all unlawful pleasures, and from lawful sometimes, upon the solemn occasions of [b] *giving our selves up to fasting and prayer*; which passage likewise Antiquity always understood of abstinence from the bed, in Priests, dureing the time they were oblig'd to officiate and administer the holy Eucharist; in the Laity, some days before they receiv'd it. And that the same Antiquity never knew any Law for such a total abstinence, as the Romanists contend for, may sufficiently appear from what has been already said upon this Argument. Secondly the reason alleg'd for the injunction in the Canon, *quo possint quod a Deo simpliciter petunt impetrare*, naturally leads us to this interpretation of it. But this Our Author thought fit to sham off with an &c. in his recital of the Canon. Thirdly, the 18*th*

[a] Κατὰ τὰς ὡρισμένας ἡμέρας τῆς ἰδίας ἐφημερίας. [b] 1 Cor. 7. 5.

Canon

Canon of the Council in *Trullo* thus expreſsly expounds it; as *Balſamon* likewiſe obſervs, who tells us, the Latins miſtake groſsly in the ſence of it. Fourthly, the *Bodleian MS.* of theſe Canons, publiſh'd by the learned Dr. *Beveridge*, has afforded us a large expoſition of this Canon to the very ſame purpoſe. Fifthly, the *African* Fathers, in 19*th* Canon of the third *Carthaginian* Council, acknowledg chaſtity [a] conſiſtent with the uſe of the Matrimonial bed, and cannot therefore in this place be thought to prohibit it. What my Author has tackt to this Canon, as the Vote of all the Fathers of this Council: *ab univerſis Epiſcopis dictum eſt &c.* appears to have been the ſentiment only of *Fauſtinus*, Legat of the *Roman* See, who would have obtruded the *Roman* Conſtitutions in this caſe upon the *African* Churches; for another reading of this Canon, and the Greek edition of it in the [b] Code of the Canons of the *African* Church, atribute, what my Author has quoted, expreſsly to him and not to the Council. After which it is added (but that he thought not fit to acquaint his Reader with) *ab omnibus dictum eſt: placet* (not, *ut ab uxoribus ſe abſtineant*, as *Fauſtinus* would have had it, but) *ut in omnibus, & ab omnibus, pudicitia cuſtodiatur, qui altari deſerviunt.* And how conſiſtent theſe *African* Fathers thought Chaſtity with conjugal enjoyments, we have already ſeen. But the true meaning of the following 37*th* Canon of the ſecond *African* Council, it need were, farther confirms our expoſition of this. For the *propria ſtatuta*, according to which the Biſhops, Preſbyters, and Deacons, were to abſtain from their Wives

[a] Hoc caput 19. vetuſti codices ſic habent; ut Lectores uſque ad annos pubertatis legant, deinceps autem, niſi *uxores, cuſtodita judicitia, duxerint*, aut continentiam profeſſi fuerint, legere non finantur.

[b] Vide Bever. in hunc Can.

are, in the Greek tranſlation [a] of this Canon, and in the 13*th* of the Council in *Trullo*, where this Canon is recited, interpreted by the terms of ἴδιοι ὅροι [b], and, to the ſame purpoſe, by the *Scholia* upon *Ariſtenus's* epitome of it, ἴδιοι ὅροι, the turns or courſes of miniſtration appropriated to each Prieſt or certain numbers of them. For, ſays *Balſamon* upon this Council, the Fathers of the Council in *Trullo* make mention of *turns* or *courſes*, and in great and Catholic Churches the Miniſtries of the Prieſts are divided; and the 14*th* Canon of the Council of *Orleans* orders, that any Clergy-Man, who ſhall neglect the diſcharg of his Office, or ſhall refuſe to come to Church *vice ſua*, ſhall be depriv'd of the dignity of his place: and in farther confirmation of the truth of their rendring *propria ſtatuta* by ἴδιοι ὅροι, we may obſerve, that the Arch-Biſhop, *Petrus Alexandrinus*, with ſeveral other *African* Prelates, who were preſent at the Council in *Trullo*, not only ſubſcrib'd that verſion, but the expoſition of it, ſubjoin'd by the Council, which was, that the Clergy ſhould abſtain ἐν τῷ καιρῷ τῆς τῶν ἁγίων μεταχειρίσεως, during the time of their handling holy things. And ſurely my Author will allow the *African* Biſhops to have underſtood their own Canons, by which they Govern'd their Churches, better than *Gratian*, whoſe reading of *priora*, for *propria ſtatuta*, He either ignorantly, or diſingenuouſly, follows, contrary to the Autority mention'd, beſides that of the 3*d* Canon of the 5*th* Council of *Carthage*, which reads it *propria*, not *priora ſtatuta*. So that it ſtill appears, for ought this Man has produc'd to the contrary, that the Presbyters, and Deacons in the *African* Churches did not yet ſubmit to

[a] The 73*d* in Dr. Beverig his Edition.

[b] So likewiſe in the 28*th*. Canon of the collection of theſe Carthaginian Councils, interpreted by Balſamon, κατὰ τὴν καιρὸν τῆς ἑρημερίας αὐτῶν.

the

the Yoke of *Siricius* Biſhop of *Rome*, but ſtill after Ordination, retain'd and aſſociated with their Wives, except at the times prohibited by the Canons, which we have hitherto explain'd. This Paragraph he concludes with the 13*th* Canon of the Council of *Chalcedon*; which, becauſe it qualifies the 27*th* Apoſtolic Canon, (to which he refers us for his Expoſition) limiting the Readers and Singers in the choice of their Wives, allow'd them after they had dedicated themſelves to the ſervice of the Church, to the *Orthodox* [a] *Chriſtians* only; he therefore inferrs, that, according to this Canon, none of the other Clergy *might Marry at all.* An inference unworthy the Author of an art of reaſoning, for he, who ſimply confines thoſe, in the choice of their Wives, who might Marry after Ordination, to ſuch a party or denomination of people, do's not *eo ipſo*, prohibit Marriage to other orders of the Clergy in the very ſame circumſtances; much leſs, to them before they enter upon their function; which is all we are at preſent concern'd for.

And hitherto I have kept, ſays my Author, *within the times of the firſt four general Councils, to which we promiſe much conformity.* I add, and with which, *we*, of the Church of *England have* much more *conformity*, than any formerly counterfit members of it; Nay as for *conformity* with thoſe days in all points of diſcipline, I ſuppoſe he will not affirm the Church of *Rome* her ſelf thinks ſhe's oblig'd to't. I am ſure ſhe doth not live as if ſhe thought ſo, that in the preſent, as well as in ſeveral other inſtances ſhe has departed far enough from it. But we muſt return to the fatigue of Canons again; and attend his motion from *Chalcedon* to the *Port*: the *Conſtantinopolitan* Council in *Trullo*. Whoſe ſixth Canon, wherewith

§. 25. Par. 19.

a Μὴ ἐξεῖναί τινι αὐτῶν ἑτερόδοξον γυναῖκα λαμβάνειν.

he first assaults us, is nothing but a reinforcement, and farther explanation of the 27*th* of those call'd Apostolical, granting Marriage to all before Orders, to Readers and Singers after; of which before.

The 12*th* indeed enjoyns Bishops to renounce their Wives after Consecration, but without any precedent, or example of Law, in the Greek, or Eastern Churches, for [a] before that time, and that was near 700 years after Christ, they cohabited with their Wives, as well as the rest of the Clergy; Many of the Oriental Bishops having Children by [b] them after they were preferr'd to that Dignity, and the proem of the Canon it self taking notice of several most Religious Prelates in *Afric* and *Lybia*, who hitherto convers'd with them. Nay, the Fathers of the Council are miserably put to't, in excusing themselves for decreeing point blank against the Antiquity of the 5*th* Apostolic Canon in this particular; for the prime reason they allege in their defence, is, that the people, forsooth, set on doubtless by the Monks, were *scandaliz'd* at the contrary practice of the Bishops in those days: a reason highly unworthy the wisdom and gravity of such an Assembly; as what might in time oblige the Governors of the Church, to reverse, not only this, but all other truly Apostolic constitutions. Tho' it must still be said, that the paucity in respect of the rest of the Clergy, and the usual old age, of those who were advanc'd to the dignity of Bishops, alleviates the imposition of this Canon. But here I must not omit one remarque, and

a Πρὸ τῆς ϛ: συνόδου τῆς ἐν τῷ τρούλλῳ τοῦ παλατίου γινομένης ἐξῆν τοῖς ἐπισκόποις ἔχειν γυναῖκας, καὶ μετὰ τὸν ἐπισκοπικὸν ἀξίωμα. Bals. in 5. Can. Apost. So Zonaras ibid. So Matthæus Monachus in causis matrimonialibus c. 16. αὕτη γὰρ σύνοδος πρώτη ταῖς γαμεταῖς ἀποτάττεσθαι τοὺς ἐπισκόπους ἐθέσπισεν.

b Πολλοὶ γὰρ αὐτῶν ἐν τῷ καιρῷ τῆς ὀπισκοποῦς καὶ παῖδας ἐκ τῆς νομίμους γαμετῆς πεποιήκασιν. Socrat. Hist. Eccles. l. 5. c. 22.

that

that is upon the clear diſcovery my Author has made of his great faithfulneſs in his quotations, who had ignorance enough to faſten this ſecond-hand ſcrap upon the Fathers of this Council: *quoniam Apoſtoli, cum fides inciperet, ad fidelium imbecillitatem ſe magis demittebant*, &c. for alaſs ſome blind Author, or other, has, I find, impos'd upon him with a disjointed end of Latin, out of the Verſion of *Balſamon's ſcholia*, inſtead of the expreſs words of the Canon. But this it is for Men, thoſe eſpecially, who ſet up for *Guides in Controverſies*, not to conſult Originals, but, as it were in conſequence of the doctrine of their Church, to take up, every where, with ſhreds of *vulgar Latin*, inſtead of them.

The 13*th* Canon expreſsly confirms and ratifies the Marriages of Prieſts, Deacons, and ſub-Deacons, celebrated before Orders; charging them, upon the ſevereſt Eccleſiaſtic penances, not to put away their Wives, upon any ſcore of religion. *Bellarmin*, and others, ſtart infinite cavils to evacuate the force of it, thinking it doubtleſs highly prejudicial, as it is, to the *Roman* Cauſe; and indeed 'tis hardly conceiveable, what advantage my Author expects from it. For, firſt, they expreſsly ſet themſelves in direct oppoſition to the Laws of Celibacy, Vow of Continency, perpetual abſtinency from their Wives, obtruded upon the Clergy in the *Roman* Church; making her Canons, in this matter, [a] becauſe contrary to the old Apoſtolic Rule and order, as they there declare, the very [b] reaſon and occaſion of theirs: which they, ſecondly, ground upon the ſolid and laſting baſis of the Scriptures them-

[a] In ſcholiis ſuper Ariſt. epit. ἐναντιούμενον καὶ τῇ εὐαγγελικῇ καὶ τῇ ἀποστολικῇ ἀκριβείᾳ.

[b] Ἐπειδὴ ἐν τῇ Ῥωμαίων ἐκκλησίᾳ ἐν τάξει κανόνος παραδεδόσθαι διέγνωμεν, &c.

 ſelves:

ſelves: alleging, that if they had otherways decree'd, *they muſt have reproached Marriage, inſtituted by God himſelf, and bleſs'd with his preſence: the voice of the Goſpel proclaiming, that what God hath joyn'd, no Man ought to put aſunder, the Apoſtle teaching us, that Marriage is Honourable and a bed undefil'd; and that he, who is bound unto a Wife ſhould not ſeek to be looſed.* Whence we may, 3*dly*, obſerve, with what juſtice theſe Fathers could, in the preceding Canon, oblige Biſhops to ſeparate from their Wives after conſecration, ſince ſurely theſe Scriptures hold equally againſt ſuch ſeparation in Biſhops, and the reſt of the Clergy. Fourthly, that in the opinion of this great Council, the Scriptures are expreſsly againſt the practice and conſtitution of the *Roman* Church in this particular. After which, I ſhall only need once more to remark upon my Author's dealing in ſecond-hand wares again; who, in his abridgment of this Canon, has, in countenance of the *Roman* doctrine I preſume, foiſted in the term of *Sacrificing*, not extant in the body of the Canon, but taken up, I conjecture, by ſome petty Writer or other, of whom he has borrow'd it, from a too narrow verſion of the word ἱερουργεῖν, us'd by *Balſamon*, in his *Scholia* upon this place.

§. 26. *Out of the Canons then cited above*, as he ſpeaks, *you may obſerve*. Firſt, that he has not produc'd one clear proof of any injunction to the Clergy of the *Roman* Church it ſelf, to abſtain from their Wives after Ordination; a project carryed on rather by the perſonal tyranny of ſome Popes, than by the free ſuffrages Eccleſiaſtical Aſſemblies; for it do's not appear that the moſt ſtrenuous aſſerters of the Celibate amongſt them, till the dregs of time, when Religion began to be model'd purely upon the Idea of ſecular politics, ever

ever attempted its eſtabliſhment by the vote of a general Council. 2*dly*, that not only the Greek, as he affirms, but *African* Churches likewiſe, injoyn'd the the Presbyters, Deacons *&c.* no farther abſtinence from their Wives, than during the turns or courſes only of their reſpective Miniſtrations. 3*dly*, That none of theſe Councils, he has alleged, ſpeak opprobriouſly of the Marryed ſtate, as *Siricius* and other great Abetters of Celibacy in the *Roman* Church doe, but on the contrary, very honourably of it; witneſs the Council of *Gangra* in the fourth, and the general Council in *Trullo* in their 13*th* Canon. 4*thly*, 'Tis plain theſe Canons were meerly the product of human invention, which is allways apt to ſuperſtruct upon the foundations laid by others; as in this caſe, upon thoſe laid by the great Apoſtle himſelf, partly out of an unwarrantable deſire, of [a] improving upon thoſe Rules, his inſpir'd wiſdom has left us in this matter; partly out of a weak condeſcenſion to the ſcrupulous and ſuperſtitious prejudices of the people [b]; partly out of an intemperate thirſt of conciliating greater veneration to the Clergy [c]: the earlieſt of thoſe Laws being enacted in a great meaſure probably, in conſideration of the perſecutions, the Church often labour'd under, not conconſidering what enormous practices, and ſpiritual inconveniencies, the rigorous exceſſes of ſuch Laws would, in after ages, bring upon the Church of God. Theſe then, and the like, were the reaſons the ancients ſeem to have had in view in the eſtabliſhment of thoſe Laws, we have hitherto diſcours'd of; and not, as my Author imagins, any opinion of the poſſibility of the univer-

See §. 22. & 25.

Par. 17. 19. pag. 18.

a See the Scholia of Balſamon and Zonaras upon the 12*th* of the Council in Trullo.

b Πρόσκομμα τοῖς ἐντεῦθεν ἄλλοις πιθέντες καὶ σκάνδαλον. idem Can.

c Καὶ τῷ μὴ δοῦναι μώμῳ τινὶ τὰ τοῦς ἱερατικῆς καταστήσεως. ibid.

ſal

ſal attainment of the gift of Continency. For beſides, firſt, had it been ſuch current and Catholic Doctrine, as he pretends, I hope he will not ſay it could eaſily have eſcaped the knowledge of ſo many Reverend Fathers in ſuch great variety of Councils, and yet we never find it alleged by any of them. But ſecondly, the contrary very fairly ſuggeſted. If Deacons, at the time of Ordination, proteſted againſt Celibacy, upon the ſcore of their inability to contain, μὴ δυνάμενοι ὑπομένειν, the Council of *Ancyra* approv'd of it, as a ſufficient reaſon for their Marriage; and, conſequently, of the Doctrine involv'd in it, that *all Men cannot Contain.* The whole and great Council of *Nice* unanimouſly aſſented to this, amongſt other reaſons, urg'd by *Paphnutius*, againſt the ſeparation of the Marryed Clergy from their Wives, that all Men *could not bear* [b] *it.* And the Fathers of the Council of *Gangra*, in their Synodical Epiſtle to the Clergy of *Armenia*, obſerve lewdneſs to have been a conſequent of the ſtrict Celibate maintain'd by the Heretic *Euſtathius for want of* [c] *ability* in his female Followers to contain. And indeed, thirdly, I am amaz'd to think how any Man can pretend to fix ſuch an opinion upon them, who ſeem, by ſo many Canons allowing Marriage before, and either prohibiting, or not enjoyning ſeparation after Orders, to have induſtriouſly provided for this ſo Original invincible propenſity of humane nature. And, after this, if my Author want to know, why they did not then allow the Clergy to Marry after, as well as before, Orders; I anſwer, not out of any opinion they had of the univerſality of the gift of Continency,

a Μὴ δυνάμενοι παρθενεύειν, ſay Zonaras and the Scholia upon Ariſtenus's Epitome.

b Οὐ γὰρ πάντας δύναιτο φέρειν &c.

c μὴ δυνηθεῖσαι ἐγκρατεῖν ἐμοιχεύθησαν.

for,

for, upon that ſuppoſition, they might as well, if at all, with the Church of *Rome*, have univerſally denyed the uſe of Marriage to the Clergy. But, firſt, out of a deſire of rendring their order more conſpicuous for their Continency, than the Laity: ſeveral of whom they ſaw were endow'd with it; for, by this means, all thoſe, who came ſingle into the Church, or did not declare themſelves unable to contain, before their Ordination, as likewiſe all thoſe, who, upon the Death of their Wives, choſe rather to retain their places, than Marry again, were oblig'd to a ſingle life, and the Deacons being generally admitted into Orders, not under twenty five years [a] of age, and the Presbyters not under thirty, they might very well be ſuppos'd to be conſcious of their own abilitys, or inabilitys, in this kind, and that they would not raſhly caſt a *ſnare* upon themſelves, which they had liberty to avoid. Secondly, 'Tis obvious to imagin they thought the dalliances of courtſhip, and the uſual impertinences that attend the ſolemnity of a Marriage day unbecoming the decorum and gravity of thoſe, who had engag'd themſelves in the ſervice of the Church; and might therefore think fit thoſe fooleries ſhould be paſt before they had taken upon them that Sacred and important Character. Agreeable whereunto, we find the Emperour *Leo* the Philoſopher breaking off the cuſtom, which had obtain'd in the Church, of the Clergy's Marrying within the ſpace of two years after Ordination, for this reaſon, that it was *indecorous*, but no way unlawful; for I would deſire any Man to ſhew me how they, who believed the Act of *Marriage* lawful to a Prieſt, could believe the Act of *Marrying* unlawful; which was therefore prohibited, not upon any reaſons intrinſic to the nature of the thing, as ſeveral of

[a] Synodus Neocæſar. can. 11. Carthag. 3. can. 4. &c.

the *Roman* Doctors allege, but, as they conceived, for pure *decency* and order.

And now, after all, I ſhall deſire the impartial Reader to recollect, what has been ſaid upon this Argument (for I will not upbraid his memory with a recapitulation) and then tell me, whether theſe very Canons he has alleg'd; none of which prohibit Marriage before Orders, nor command ſeparation of Man and Wife after them; do more favour the Church of *Rome*, who ſtrictly inhibits *all her Clergy all uſe of Marriage*, notwithſtanding *all the abominations* that neceſſarily attend the injunction; or, the Reform'd Churches, who reinſtate them in that intire liberty in this matter, wherein Chriſt and his Apoſtles thonght fit to leave them. To all which I muſt add this neceſſary reflection, that the practice of the Church of *Rome* in this point, is, at this day, follow'd by no other Churches; the practice of the Greek by thoſe of both the *Ruſſias*, by the Chriſtians under the juriſdictions of the Patriarchs of *Alexandria*, *Antioch*, and *Jeruſalem*, by the *Armenian*, as well as *Abyſſine* Churches, in which laſt, as *Tellez*, in his [a] Hiſtory of *Æthiopia* relates, the moſt reform'd Monks Marry, and their Deacons, after Ordination; and, laſtly, the practice of our own by ſeveral Eaſtern Churches, in ſome whereof Marryed Men only are admitted into Orders, in others they Marry after them, and proceed to ſecond Marriages upon Divorce in caſe of Adultery, as *Thomas a Jeſu* [b] relates of them; who farther [c] aſſures us, that the *Chaldæan* Clergy, particularly, Marry more than once, if occaſion be, upon the death of their former Wives. All which I will cloſe with the Teſtimony of *Antonio de Gouvea*, who, in his [d] Hiſtory of the Arch-Biſhop of *Goa's* Viſitation of the Ancient Chriſtians inhabit-

[a] l. 1. c. 39. [b] l. 7. [c] c. 8. [d] l. 1. c. 14.

ing

ing the mountains of *Malabar*, commonly call'd the Chriſtians of St. *Thomas*, tells us, that their Prieſts are generally Marryed, contract Matrimony after they are in Orders, and, upon the death of their Wives, proceed to ſecond, third, and fourth Marriages; as they ſee occaſion.

But ſtill my Author, after all his forc'd endeavors, reflecting, as we may rationally conjecture, upon that vaſt diſparity betwixt the Celibate (if it amount to that name) enjoyn'd by the Canons he has produc'd, and that ſtrictly commanded in the Church of *Rome*; thought fit, before he made any farther advance, to wipe off, as well as he could, an unlucky blot caſt upon their Doctrine from the reſemblance it bears to that of Devils, mention'd 1 *Tim.* 4. which Paragraph, tho' ſeeming to me purely to interlope in this argument, I ſhall however take in, as a dependance, ſince he has thrown it in my way, and the reaſons he produces to fetch off his Church from this untoward imputation, are theſe. Firſt, *becauſe the Apoſtle, by oppoſing to ſuch error, that every creature, and ordinance of God is good, and therefore being ſanctified firſt by the word of God and prayer, may lawfully be uſed, ſheweth, that he means ſuch Apoſtates, as abſtain from, or prohibit Marriage, and Meats, as in themſelves unlawful and unclean, and contaminating, which thing can neither be objected to the ancient, nor modern Church practice &c.* To which 'tis anſwer'd, firſt, that the words of St. *Paul*, (*every creature of God is good*) upon which he builds the difference betwixt the Church of *Rome*, and the ancient Heretics in this matter, are not ſpoke with reference to abſtinence from Marriage, but meats only (with which I am not at preſent

§. 27.

[a] 1 Tim. 4. v. 4, 5.

concern'd) as appears to every naked eye from the leaſt inſpection into the text; and therefore my Author, to make them countenance his argument, like a true Champion for the cauſe, is not afraid by the addition of his own word (*ordinance*) to that in the text, to corrupt the word of God in the face of the Sun, for I muſt take any ſupplements to a text not to be expoſitions but corruptions, and he foreſaw, without this ſupplement, the text would not be found to relate to the prohibition of Marriage, the thing he was here principally concern'd in. Secondly, theſe words of the Apoſtle are no *limitation* of the charge of diabolical Doctrine only upon thoſe, who prohibited, either Meats, or Marriage, upon account of a ſuppos'd inherent unlawfulneſs, or uncleanneſs, in them; but only a general axiom, or principle, layd by him in behalf of the indifferent uſe of meats, and (if my Author will have it ſo) of Marriage; no more than our Savior's rebuking, for inſtance, his Diſciples, for forbidding little Children to come unto him, when he adds, that, *of ſuch is the Kingdom of Heaven*,[a] does thereby condemn only thoſe who hinder'd the Childrens acceſs to him, upon ſuppoſition of their incapacity of the Kingdom of Heaven; (for the Diſciples entertain'd no ſuch opinion) his words being only one general and comprehenſive reaſon, why Children ſhould be admitted to his preſence. But, 3*dly*, what if ſeveral conſiderable members of his own Church have ſpoke as hard things of Matrimony, as thoſe, he juſtly charges upon the old Heretics. He has heard[b] already, upon another occaſion, of the ſcandalous and derogatory ſentiments of two Popes, [c] *Siricius*, and [d] *Innocent*, (the firſt violent Champions in this Cauſe) of

a Matt. 19. 14.

b Anſwer to Conſiderations on the Spirit of Martin Luther. p. 18.

c Siricius Ep. ad Himerium c. 7.

d Innocent Exuperio Toloſano Epiſc. Ep. 3. c. 1. Diſtinc. 82. propoſuiſti.

two

two Saints, *Dunſtan*, and *Oſwald*, and laſtly of a [a] Council it ſelf, in relation to Marriage, ſtileing it Carnal and unpleaſing to God; unholy and unclean; beaſtlineſs, and abominable contagion. We find in *Gratian* [c], that Marryed Men ought to be ſecluded the Prieſthood, becauſe Prieſts are oblig'd to chaſtity of converſation, as if the conjugal condition and that were utterly inconſiſtent, and that the cauſe of the inſtitution was the purity of the Prieſthood. *Cauſa hujus inſtitutionis munditia fuit ſacerdotalis.* *Bellarmin* [d] affirms, that the act renders a Man altogether Carnal and unqualifi'd for Divine things. And *Baronius* [e] himſelf, ſpeaking of Marryed Clergy, ſtiles them flat *filthineſs*, and *the net of the Devil*, and indeed, to ſpare farther inſtances, the Patrons of the Celibat, would they all of them ſpeak out, muſt, and do, ultimatly ground their injunction upon a ſuppos'd moral impurity in the conjugal ſtate, conceiv'd incompatible with the ſanctity of the ſacred function. And even this Diſcourſer himſelf has not been able, with all his Artifice, to diſſemble his ſence of this matter; for, endeavouring to diſcriminate the practice of his Church herein from that of the Heretics, tho' he tells us they enjoyn not abſtinence from Meats for *any uncleanneſs* in the food, as the Heretics did; yet, when he comes to account for their prohibition of Marriage, he durſt not aſſign the ſame difference betwixt them in relation to that, tho' fairly led to't by the known ſentiments of thoſe Heretics about it; but with his wonted ſlyneſs, paſſing it over, proceeds to another, pretended, difference betwixt them, of which by and by. And therefore he might

[a] Vide regiſtrum Eccleſ. Wigorn. apud Bp. Hall, Honour of the Married Clergy, l. 3. §. 10.
[b] Council. Tollet. 8. c. 5.
[c] Diſtinc. 31. cap. ante triennium, & Sacerdotibus, &, tenere debet.
[d] Bellarmin l. 1. de Cler. c. 28.
[e] Baronius, an. 1074. num. 34.

have ſpar'd the ſecond Argument, whereby he endeavours to wipe of the imputation of diabolical Doctrine
p. 19. from his Church; that, *experience has manifeſted the Apoſtle's Propheſy to have been eminently fulfill'd in other perſons of theſe latter times*, namely, the old heretical Guoſtics, Encratites, Montaniſts &c. For where's the conſequence? theſe people taught the Doctrine of Devils, in point of Marriage, and therefore the Romaniſts do not. I will not ſay they are altogether as culpable in this point as the other, but, yet, the difference betwixt them, lying in the degree of their guilt, not in the kind, the Apoſtle's imputation extends ſtill, tho' not equally, to both; as the command, *non mæchaberis*, for example, reaches, not only the groſſer Sins of Inceſt, and Adultery, but the more venial one, in the phraſe of ſome Writers of their Church, of
p. 20. ſimple Fornication. *But the purpoſe of this Propheſy cannot be carried beyond the days of theſe ancient Heretics:* Very good. But why not? *becauſe that expreſſion of the latter times doth not ſeem in the Apoſtle's drift, ſo to indicate the future times, as altogether to exclude the preſent.* The wonderful force of reaſon! the latter times, mention'd by the Apoſtle, are not to be *extended beyond* the days of thoſe Heretics, he has muſter'd up, becauſe they *do not altogether exclude* them. This it is to be a Guide in Controverſies. The Apoſtle, in the *v.* immediatly following, makes it a part of the character of thoſe perſons he diſcribes, that *they ſhall ſpeak lyes in hypocriſy*, which do's not exclude the ancient Heretics from the imputation, and therefore no Man ſince, is any ways concern'd in't.

But again, *if the latter times exclude the days of the Fathers, then we muſt free them, and, conſequently,*

ly, the Church of Rome, which affirms no more in theſe matters than the Fathers did, from any ſuch imputation. If theſe latter times involve the days of the Fathers alſo, this Propheſy muſt mean either them, or the Heretics, cotemporaries with them; and whether of theſe, he leaves, in great triumph, *to the Reader's judgment.*

I tell him then, firſt, that by *the latter times* here ſpoke of, I underſtand, in one word, the Reign of the Goſpel, and that, eſpecially, becauſe I have herein the countenance of an old acquaintance of my Author's, in the firſt Paragraph of his Hiſtorical narration of the *Life and Death of our Saviour*, Printed not many years ago, at the Theater in *Oxford*. Secondly, that tho' I cannot but commend him for his endeavour to bring the Fathers in for company into the ſame condemnation with his Church, yet I muſt deſire him to excuſe them, till, from their confeſs'd admiration of the Single Life, and their eulogi's of it, (which is all he has produc'd out of 'em, letting aſide the extravagances of St. *Jerom*) he can ſhew, they defam'd Marriage as criminal, approv'd of Fornication in Prieſts and Votaries before it, paſs'd the Roman Celibate into a Law, and obſtinately refuſed ſtill to repeal it, notwithſtanding the repeated inſtances of Princes, States, Empires, Pious and Learn'd Men of their own, grounded upon the conſtant dayly experience of the lewdneſs it every where occaſions. When he can ſhew this, then I will begin to believe the Fathers likewiſe were infected with this Doctrine of Devils, ſo ſtiled, not upon account of any Argument the evil Spirit us'd to introduce it, as, the unlawfulneſs of Marriage, or the like; but, on the ſcore of thoſe diabolical and debauch'd practices it neceſſarily drew after it, and do's ſtill to this

this day, to the eternal reproach of that Church, and the ſcandal of our common Chriſtianity; ſo that, for ought I ſee, the Prophecy may ſtill point out the old Heretics, and many ſince, and yet leave the Fathers, generally, unconcern'd. And ſince we are upon this argument, I care not if I obſerve two or three things more to him, which may a little induce a Man to believe, that the Prophecy had an eye to theſe latter times of ours, as well as to others. Firſt, that if the ὕστεροι καιροὶ of St. *Paul* are applicable to all ages of the Church after Chriſt, they are certainly moſt ſo to the laſt, and accordingly his belov'd vulgar Latin renders them by *noviſſima tempora*. Secondly, that the other part of the character of the perſons here intended, their *ſpeaking ly's in hypocriſy*, ſeems not ſo applicable to the early Heretics, whoſe impietys were groſs and notorious, with little or no colour of diſſimulation. 3*dly*, that the Apoſtle, immediatly before he predicted the forbidding of Marriage by *ſeducing Spirits*, had allow'd the Clergy the uſe of it, (1 *Tim*. 3. 2. 12. &c.) which ſeems more peculiarly to reſtrain the Prophecy in debate to thoſe, who ſhould prohibit it to Men of that Order; and who they are, *I leave*, in his phraſe, *to the Reader's judgment*. And ſhall only remarque to him, upon the whole, what *Aventin* relates of the thoughts of all ſenſible Men of *Hildebrand's* days, in relation to his firſt eſtabliſhing this iniquity by a Law - *All good, open, juſt, ingenious, plain Men publickly dated the reign of Antichriſt from that time, clearly diſcovering the completion of thoſe things, which our Saviour had foretold ſo many years before*.

There remains but one ſhift more, in this Paragraph,

Annal. Baron. l. 5.

to

to be ſpoke to; which is this, and an uſual piece of Sophiſtry amongſt them, *that they forbid not Marrying to any ſingle perſon abſolutely, but only upon his voluntary undertaking the ſacred imployment.* To which 'tis briefly anſwered, that tho' they do not indeed *abſolutely* lay this injunction upon perſons, conſider'd barely *as Men*, yet, ſince *in the capacity of Clergy-men*, they *abſolutely* impoſe it upon them; the impoſition is ſtill equally pernicious and unjuſt, unleſs they can firſt ſhew, that Men, upon commencing Prieſts, are immediatly diveſted of their humanity, and take upon them the nature of Angels. For the injuſtice of the prohibition is ultimately grounded upon the circumſtances of our humanity, and the neceſſary and flagitious conſequences, which ſuch a Law, thereupon, inevitably draws after it. p. 19.

Revert we now, from a tedious parentheſis, to our buſineſs again, the proof of *the univerſality of this gift from Antiquity*, and, in my Author's judgement, *it may be gather'd from the vowing of virginity, much uſed, allowed, recommended by them.* Admirable! thoſe good Men, out of a miſtaken opinion, from a paſſage of St. *Paul* upon this occaſion [*tempus in collecto eſt,*] that the laſt day was at hand; a com- from thoſe inconveniences, which Marrying into Heathen Families, then frequently practic'd, brought upon the Chriſtian Profeſſors, had the gift of continency, and thoſe, conſequently, who were endow'd with it, in great veneration; and therefore they were of opinion that all Mankind might attain it, if they pleas'd. What need a Man dwell upon expoſing ſuch reaſoning as this? But *the Fathers denyed Marriage, the remedy of incontinency, to all ſuch as have paſs'd a vow, which argues that they held the gift of Continency denyed to* p. 28. p. 27.

none ſuch. Suppoſing ſo for once, yet why ſhould any Man hence infer that they thought it denyed to none at all? eſpecially if it be conſider'd, that they had juſt reaſon to preſume that no Man would ingage himſelf in that ſort of life, who had not found himſelf before hand, at leaſt, a competent Maſter of it, and of which perhaps he had given ample teſtimony by a long and eaſy continuance in it. And yet, *2dly*, this denyal of Marryage to votaries amounts ſtrictly to no more, than to ſo many warm and pathetical incitements to a ſpotleſs perſeverance in that ſtate of life, wherein they had voluntarily, and, as preſumed, cautiouſly imbarqued themſelves; and this, upon conſideration of the ſolemnity of their [a] ingagement, the greatneſs of the [b] reward, which, ſaid they, waited virginity in another world, and the Honour of the Church, which, amongſt the Fathers, no ſtrangers to the Celibate, ſuffer'd in her [c] reputation from revolts of this nature; but not upon the ſcore of any opinion they had of an intire poſſibility of the continency of every votary. For, *3dly*, they many times in their diſcourſes upon this Subject ſuppoſe the contrary; as in the places pro-
p. 25. duc'd by this Author.

S[illegible]*rom*[d], as ſtrenous a Champion as he was for the Cauſe, allows Marriage expreſly to thoſe votaries, *qui ſe non poſſunt continere.* St. *Cyprian*[e], diſtinguiſhing, as it were purpoſly, to obviate this forc'd and unnatural interpretation of Men's *inabilities* by their

[a] See the Teſtimonies cited by the Author.

[b] See St. Cypr. de diſciplina & habitu Virginum, & ep. ad Pomponium, both quoted by him. See the Preface of the 104. Can. of the 4*th* Council of Carthage, cited by him likewiſe. Auguſt. de bono viduitatis c. 9. ſed in viduali & originali continentia excellentia muneris amplioris expetitur.

[c] Ne Eccleſiæ lœdant æſtimationem. Concil. Carthag. 3. Can. 33. cited by this Author.

[d] Ep. ad Demetriadem. 8.

[e] Ep. ad Pomponium. 62.

want

want of *will*, grants it to thoſe, who either *will not*, or *cannot* perſevere. And St. *Auſtin*, in his application of that paſſage, [*it is better to marry than to burn*] to Votaries, as well as others, muſt ſuppoſe that ſome of them *could not contain* (and might therefore lawfully marry,) if conſiſtent with his own expoſition of that paſſage of our Saviour. [*All men receive not this ſaying*] i.e. according to him, *cannot* receive it. For, by that expreſſion, upon which this Diſcourſer faſtens, [*mei correctum cor dirigant* &c.] His intent was not to ſhew, that all Votaries might contain, *if they would*; but that they, who, to avoid the diſgrace of renouncing their profeſſion, will chooſe ſtill to burn on rather than to marry, are *in mortuis deputandæ*, as he ſpeaks, unleſs God gives them grace to ſubdue their inclinations. To theſe he muſt give me leave to add *Chryſoſtom*, *Ambroſe*, (who, in his Comment upon 1 *Tim.* 5. 14. Stiles ſuch marriages ſimply, *lawful.*) *Theophylact*, and the ſame St. *Auſtin* again; who, as we have ſeen before, expounding the Apoſtle's *volo juniores nubere* of the vow'd Widows, muſt with the Apoſtle himſelf, hold it lawful for them (and conſequently for any other Votaries) to marry, after the obligation of a Vow, in caſe of inability to contain. And, what is greater than all their Autorities put together without it, the reaſon of the thing ſpeaks no leſs. For the due intention of the Vow being only a greater, or rather a different ſort of, ſanctity of life; that end, which, when acquirable, recommends the Vow, and obliges to its performance; obliges likewiſe to, and therefore ſanctifies, the breach of it, when not attainable, but obſtructed by the Vow. But admit this Diſcourſer's hypotheſis, that they held ſuch marriages

See §. 19.

See §. 17.

p. 25.

* De Sⁿ. Virginitate c. 34.

not abſolutely lawful in themſelves, but comparatively only, in reſpect of the greater evil of wandring avoided by them. Yet, what, is this to the juſtification of her Laws in this caſe? which not only deny her Votaries and Clergy the liberty to prefer the *leſs evil*, in his phraſe to the greater; but, againſt the whole Current and fulleſt tide of Antiquity, quite null and reſcind their Marriages, as downright Adulteries, turning the remedy, preſcribed by God himſelf againſt Fornication, into a meer political bugbear to affright ſuch great numbers of people from dareing to make any uſe of it. Nor will, in the next place, that novel and frivolous diſtinction of *ſimple* and *ſolemn* Vows do him any more ſervice. For if a ſimple Vow be a complete
p. 24. Vow, and yet, as he grants, diſannulls not ſuch Marriages, neither can the acceſſion of a few foppiſh Solemnities, which is the only difference betwixt them, becauſe perfectly extrinſic to the nature of the Vow, and which therefore can receive no freſh obligation from them; but the *non poſſunt perſeverare & continere* of St. *Cyprian* and St. *Jerom*, ſpoken in relation to Votaries, ſtick ſtill in his Stomach, and therefore he pretends they meant only by that expreſſion, that they *would not*, (not, *could not*,) contain; as if, (*poſſum & volo* were terms Synonymous) and that, firſt, becauſe *the ſame Fathers allow per-*
p. 26. *petual Vows*; as if they who allow'd the making of perpetual Vows to thoſe, who could keep them, at the ſame time affirm'd that all perſons might keep them, if they pleas'd. Our Saviour adviſes thoſe, who *can receive* the ſingle Life, to imbrace it, rather than marriage, and therefore he affirms that all Men may receive it, notwithſtanding he manifeſtly diſtinguiſhes

betwixt

betwixt thoſe who can and can not. 2*dly*, Theſe Fathers *hold the poſſibility of continency in all: ſhewed before.* Before? where? in my Author's imaginations only, but becauſe he has here interſpers'd ſome citations that look that way, he ſhall ſee we are not afraid to attack him even in his own Camp, the Autorities of the Fathers, wherein the main ſtrength of his Cauſe conſiſts. And firſt that paſſage out of St. *Jerom* upon the 19*th* of St. *Matthew* relates only to the confutation of thoſe, who, from our Saviour's words, aſcribed, it ſeems, Virginity to Fate or Chance, as is plain from the expreſs words of his Comment; and in which I am the rather confirm'd, becauſe the ſequel thereof upon the following words, *Qui poteſt capere capiat*, places continency for the Kingdom of Heaven, in the plaineſt terms that can be, out of ſome Men's reach. But that was not fit to be known, and I hope we may better learn his ſence of this matter from a Comment upon Scripture; than from his books againſt *Jovinian*, (whence he has cull'd his ſecond citation) where the warmth of his temper, and a too eager purſuit of his Adverſary have many times carried him, beyond the meaſures of juſt reaſoning, to unjuſtifiable exceſs, in the cenſure of ſome Prelates, according to *Eraſmus's* remark upon the book [b]. What Author of any Logic, can ſtand by him in ſuch argumentation as this? *Si bonum eſt mulierem non tangere, ergo malum eſt tangere*, &c. Or, even will this Man defend him in his running down the divine inſtitution of Marriage as a thing no way good in it ſelf? I ſpeak not this to award off a blow, for the place he has alleg'd relates p 26.

[a] Sed conſiderandæ ſunt vires, ut qui poteſt capere capiat. See §. 19.

[b] Impendio ſemper favens virginitati, & ob id nuptiis iniquior, quam Epiſcopi quidam eſſe volebant. Eraſ. in argumento libri.

not to the univerſal poſſibility of continency, the matter at preſent in hand; and this I am ſure of, that what ever St. *Jerom*, in this place, thinks of that great aphoriſm of the Apoſtle. (it is better to Marry than to burn) the Author of it ſpoke indifferently of all Men, reaſon ſeconds him, and St. *Auſtin*, according to my
p. 25. Adverſary's own citation, applys it to Votaries. And, as for the places alleg'd out of this Father, they come no way home to the point; for, beſides that all incidental paſſages of this kind ought to be interpreted
See §. 19. in conformity with his expoſition of our Savior's words in the 19*th* of St. *Matt.* which according to him, make the gift of continency particular; the firſt place [a] relates only to his own miſtake in thinking continency attainable by the ſtrength of pure nature, which he afterwards found was not wrought in himſelf without the aſſiſtance and cooperation of the Divine Spirit. The 2*d*, [b] ſpeaks of thoſe only, who having been by violence and injuſtice denyed the uſe of Wives, God was pleas'd to give them the grace to contain; a caſe vaſtly dif-
See § 6. ferent from a voluntary, and, in many perſons ſinful, obligation to the ſingle life. The [c] third is quite forreign to his purpoſe, aſcribing barely the power of performance of Vows to his aſſiſtance, to whom they are made. The ſenſe, *Chryſoſtom* puts upon the words of our Lord *Matt.* 19[d]. is peculiar to himſelf, and, beſides that it renders his anſwer to his Diſciples lame and impertinent, (for if, as he expounds it, (in my Author's Latin) *His [datum eſt, qui ſponte eligunt*, it remain'd ſtill univerſally, *good not to marry*) I hope one allyed to the Guide in Controverſies will not oblige us to adhere to one, againſt ſo great a majority of voices.

a See Maldonat. in loc. l. 6. Confeſſ. c 11.

b De adulterinis conjugiis l. 2. c. 20.

c In Pſal. 137. d v. 11.

As

As to thoſe two or three paſſages out of *Calvin* and *Juſtin Martyr*, wherein they acknowledge the early *Superſtition*, which, in this point, had infected the Church, and declare her Canons, in this particular, no competent rule for after Ages to walk by, it need only be ſaid, that, as the intemperate zeal of ſome Patrons of the Celibate could hardly deſerve a ſofter appellation, ſo the *Roman* Church her ſelf has ſufficiently juſtified them in their opinion of the non-obligation of thoſe Canons to future Ages, by departing at leaſt, as widely from them on the one hand, as the Reform'd have done on the other. His defence of the two other uſual Vows of a Monaſtic life, tack'd to the end of this long winded Paragraph, I am not directly concern'd in; and ſhall therefore only add, that, ſetting aſide his, ridiculous, compariſon of the Vow of *Poverty* with a Father's parting with a portion of his Eſtate to his Son, and of the Vow of *Obedience* with a Servant's promiſing the like to his Maſter: there remains yet a conſiderable objection againſt the recluſes of the Cloiſter; and that is from a fourth Vow they take to execute the infernal Bull *de Cœna Domini*[a].

p. 24.

p. 28.

And now, after all theſe fruitleſs endeavours, to countenance the practice of his Church, in relation to Vows, from the Scriptures, and Fathers, he proceeds, in the next place to ſhew, that, *neither is there any argument to be drawn from reaſon* (and I'le aſſure him I value none without it) *why we may not preſume on God's aſſiſtance and enablement of us to perform ſuch a Vow.* If reaſon furniſh us with any, he conceives them to be theſe. Firſt, *that it is Vowing*

§. 29.

Par 23.

[a] On ſcait que tous les Moines, & les Jeſuites en particulier, par un quatriém vœu s' obligent à l' execution de cette infernale Bulle. *Moyens ſors & bonnêtes* &c. p. 269.

a thing not neceſſary to Salvation. Secondly, *that we are not certain of our ability and command of our will to uſe the means* for the attainment of the gift. 3*dly*, *that this ability is not from our ſelves, but from God.*

To the firſt then, he replies by ſeveral inſtances of Vows, we are enabl'd to keep, and which yet are no way neceſſary to our Salvation; as, the *giving ſuch or ſuch a proportion of alms to the poor; of uſing every day two or three times of Prayer extraordinary; of not drinking Wine, becauſe of many former temptations by it to exceſs* &c.

The Diſcourſer I find has as unlucky a hand at forming arguments for us, as he has for himſelf; and therefore ſince we here have a fair call to't, wee'l ſpeak for our ſelves. The reaſon then why we believe all Men ought not to preſume upon ſufficient abilities from God to keep the Vow of perpetual Virginity, is not, ſimply, that the ſingle life is a thing unneceſſary to our Salvation, but is, in it ſelf, of an adiaphorous, or indifferent nature, as is acknowledg'd by my Author
Par. 11. himſelf. Proper indeed for the advancement of piety in thoſe, whom God is pleas'd, by his ſpecial grace, to ſingle out for it, but, on the other hand, of dangerous, and too often deſtructive, conſequence to the Salvation of ſuch as he never deſign'd for it. But now, the inſtances he alleges are of things, not abſolutely neceſſary to Salvation indeed, but ſuch however as carry intrinſic worth and goodneſs along with them; and ſo are indiſputably proper for all Mankind to practice and who may, therefore univerſally, expect ability from God to perform any Vows they have made in relation to them, and yet at the ſame time ought not to promiſe themſelves the like aſſiſtance as to thoſe, they have made in reference to the ſingle life.

The

The ſecond argument concerning the uncertainty of our abilities, is but a conſequent of the firſt; and his anſwer to it accordingly obviated in replying to his anſwer to that.

The third argument, as He has fram'd it for us, has perfectly the ſame ſtrength with that of his own; for who ever urg'd it as a reaſon, diſmember'd from any other conſideration, againſt the Vow of continency, *that our ability to perform it, is not from our ſelves but from God*? Let us ſee however what He replies to it. Why then, *Faith, and Repentance are from God likewiſe, and yet, in Baptiſm, we make a Vow of them. But the expreſſions concerning them in Scripture, are the ſame as thoſe concerning continency, to wit, that they are not given to all, it being ſaid in the* 13*th of St. Matth. at the* 11 *v. It is given unto you to know the myſteries of the Kingdom of Heaven, but to them it is not given.* But could not this argumentative Writer obſerve, that, the words, *not given*, in this place of St. Matth. are meant of the *ſecondary aſſiſtant* influences of God's grace, withdrawn upon neglect or abuſe of the *firſt motions* of it, by obſtinate *unbelievers*; as is plain from the ſubſequent words where our Saviour declares, that, *to him who hath* (or cultivates the divine grace) *ſhall be given* more grace? whereas the ſame words, *not given*, in the other place of St. Matth. ſpoken with reference to *believers* themſelves, are meant of the very *firſt illapſes* of his grace, as has been already ſufficiently evinc'd; and that, therefore, tho' Faith and Repentance may be univerſally vow'd, yet continency not. As for his anſwer to the objection he foreſaw to this Argument, from the neceſſity of the foremention'd gifts to Salvation; that God will

v. 12.

See §. 19.

* Matt. 19. 11. compared with 1. Cor. 7. 7.

p. 29. however no more be wanting in grace to the attainment of the *perfection*, *he adviſes*, than *of the Duty*, *he commands*, it has been already refuted; and will then deſerve to be farther conſider'd, when he ſhall have ſhown, that, the *perfection* in his phraſe i. e. the ſingle life, is as *univerſally adviſ'd*, as *duty is commanded*; in confutation of what we have before evinc'd, that the councel of it reaches only thoſe, to whom [a] the gift of continency is eſpecially given. *But why then is not* the promiſe of *petenti dabitur re-*
p. 29. *ſtrain'd alſo to neceſſaries*? and why, I would fain know, ſince the queſtion here is concerning the certain grant of our requeſts, is it extended any farther? or what ſecurity can this Author give any Man that he ſhall be certainly heard in every petition he puts
See §. 12. up to God for things *lawful only*? no, I have ſhown him before, and thither I remit him, that the divine goodneſs do's not always anſwer Men's Prayers of that nature *in Kind*, his wiſdom ſeeing it, many times, more expedient to grant them *an equivalent*. There remains nothing more in this Paragraph to be ſpoke to, unleſs I would run into the ſame vain repetitions with himſelf.

The deſign of the firſt part of the next Paragraph is an incouragement to the making of vows upon this conſideration, that continency, which we are now up-
par. 24. on, for example, *receives a much higher value from vows than without them*. To which 'tis briefly replied, that ſuch votaries either ſtand in need of the obligation of a vow to engage them in that courſe of life, or they do not, if not, then is there no freſh acceſſion of *merit*, as they call it, from making ſuch vows; if they do, then, ſay I, is a free and uncon-

[a] Matt. 19. 10. and 11. v. compared with v. 12.

ſtrain'd

ſtrain'd Virtue more valuable than a forc'd one; and therefore, whereas he flouriſhes, *that, to act good, as it were neceſſarily, is angelical;* I muſt confeſs, I pretend not to know the nature of Angels ſo well as they who religiouſly invocate them ſhould do; yet certainly virtue in Men, (and our diſpute relates to them, I conceive, not to Angels,) is enhanced by the freedom of their will to vice. I deny not but that there is frequent mention made of vows in Scripture, as he urges; but then ſtill I deſire this Author to ſhow me, that the vows there ſaid to be made lay equally out of the reach of Man's ability to perform them, as the vow of perpetual continency do's, and till he has done that, he begs the queſtion.

Come we now, in the next place, to conſider his Anſwers to thoſe texts we allege *againſt vowing; at leaſt before ſixty, or for leave given to Marry, tho' it be after vows, upon incontinency.* And his firſt attacque is directed againſt thoſe places in the 1 Tim. Chap. 5. where the Apoſtle orders, that *no Widow be taken into the Number* of thoſe, who were to Miniſter to the ſick, &c. under *ſixty years of Age* v. 9. and that, *the younger Women Marry*, v. 14. Now, ſays he, *in anſwer to them*, I take this *firſt for granted, that all thoſe, young or old, who have the power to be continent, may ſafely vow it; ſince the reaſon given by the reform'd, why it may not be vowed, is, becauſe it is a thing not in our power.* To which he might have pleas'd to have added, and that according to his own principles, a farther reaſon againſt the vow of *perpetual* continency, and that is, the poſſibility of God's *withdrawing* the gift for the future. But, ſecondly, theſe places, cannot prove the points, for which they are produced, becauſe the Apoſtle *would*

§. 30. par. 14. par. 11.

then be made to contradict himself, in affirming, that the younger Widows *had damnation for Marrying*, whereas, he muſt, upon our ſuppoſition, have ſaid, that they had *damnation*, *for making ſuch a vow*, *which they muſt neceſſarily break*. I muſt beg the
See §. 17. Reader's pardon if this Writers tautologie oblige me here to repeat ſome things, which have been already ſaid upon this ſubject; the Diſcourſer then may find leave to Marry after vows, in caſe of incontinency, and the damnation here meant for Marrying, very compatible; if he pleaſes only to conſider, firſt, that the damnation, or guilt, as he himſelf explains it, here ſpoke of, relates, principally, to the motive of ſuch Marriages, the *wanton* and laſcivious humor, that promoted them to it; and to the frequent fatal conſequences of it, their renounceing thereby their Chriſtianity it ſelf by matching with Infidels, as has been before explain'd, and that on the other hand, the leave given to Marry extends only to their Marrying *in the Lord*, or with converts to Chriſtianity, as before obſerv'd. Secondly, that, abſtracting from theſe conſiderations, the damnation, or guilt, the young Women incurr'd, was not purely upon the account of their remarrying, (for ſo he would never have adviſ'd them to it, as yet we have ſeen he did
§. 17. v. 14. from the expoſition of the Fathers themſelves) but, on the ſcore of that ſcandal, and diſgrace, they thereby brought upon the Church, as the Apoſtle himſelf do's not obſcurely intimate, when he commands them, for the future, not to liſt themſelves in the ſervice of the Church, but rather, to Marry; *that*
v. 14. *they give none occaſion to the adverſaries to ſpeak reproachfully* of the Church, by their lapſes from their

a 1 Tim. 5. 11. compared with 1 Cor. 7. 39.

engage-

engagements. And now what inconſiſtency betwixt affirming of theſe young Women, that, upon theſe accounts, they were highly culpable, and yet, that, v. 12. this notwithſtanding, they ſhould Marry rather than bring a greater, and in many perſons, unavoidable, guilt upon themſelves by continuing their profeſſion? thirdly, he, who blames a perſon for a fault, dos certainly, at the ſame time, blame him for the occaſion of it, if he voluntarily brought it upon himſelf, as we have already ſeen; the Apoſtle therefore muſt be §. 17. ſuppos'd to do ſo in the caſe of theſe Women, tho' he mentions only the breach of their promiſe, not it's primary occaſion, the raſhneſs and inconſiderateneſs of making it. His anſwer to that other place of the Apoſtle (*if they cannot contain let them Marry*) that it extends not to thoſe, *who have an obligation to contain tho' they actually do not:* being ſupported only by this burden of the Song, that they may contain if they pleaſe, elſe why ſhould the Apoſtle ſay ſome Votaries had damnation for Marrying? this place, I ſay, having been already clear'd, I ſhall need make no farther reply to his anſwer, than briefly to deſire him to ſuperadd only the ſequel, and reaſon, of that part of the verſe he has cited, which is this: that *it is better to Marry than to burn:* and then let him, if he has the forehead, give the Apoſtle the lye, and boldly affirm that it is better for thoſe vaſt numbers of people, who have vowed, and yet do not contain, to burn on rather than to Marry, notwithſtanding St. Paul's comprehenſive determination to the contrary. But my Author has a quarrel, by the by, with our Engliſh verſion for rendring the οὐκ ἐγκρατεύονται of [b] St. Paul by theſe words, if they *cannot* contain; and

[a] 1 Cor. 7. 9. [b] Ibid.

thoſe of our Lord, οὐ πάντες χωροῦσι, by theſe, all men *cannot* receive this ſaying, and his reaſon is admirable, *becauſe the vulgar hath it otherwiſe*, as if the reform'd had unanimouſly own'd that as the ſtandard of all other tranſlations: but, as to the firſt of theſe, he needed only to have had recourſe to the etymology of the word for the juſtification of our verſion; for ἐγκρατὴς being he, who ἑαυτὸν ἐν κράτει ἔχει, i. e. *hath himſelf in his power*, he who dos not ἐγκρατεύεσθαι may juſtly and moſt properly, be ſaid to be *unable* to contain, as one, who has not *the command of himſelf* ſo as to live chaſtly without Marriage, as to his exception at the latter of theſe verſions, had he but attended to our Lord's own explication of his own words, or, to the neceſſary import of the word, he us'd in that place of St. Matth. He could never have ſtarted ſo frivolous a cavil.

For firſt, he expreſly aſcribes *all Men's not receiving the ſingle life*, not to their own default, but to
v. 11. their want of the gift, and then farther, in conſent with his own Doctrine, explicates this *not receiving it* v. 11. [οὐ πάντες χωροῦσι τὸν λόγον τοῦτον] by ſome Men's want of *ability* to receive it v. 12. [ὁ δυνάμενος χωρεῖν χωρείτω] ſecondly, this word in this place, being purely metaphorically borrow'd from a thing (place, veſſel, or the like) that holds, or contains, another; as we moſt properly ſay, that a veſſel, for inſtance, cannot (nor *will not*, nor, *do's not*) comprehend a thing that exceeds it's dimenſions: ſo, do we moſt juſtly, in this place, render the words of our Savior [οὐ πάντες χωροῦσι &c.] thus: all Men *cannot* receive this ſaying, as that, which bearing no proportion to the capacities of ſome, *cannot* be admitted by them. In anſwer to

Matt. 19. 11.

the

the third place we urge, where the Apoſtle, diſcourſing of the difference betwixt the ſingle, and the conjugal ſtate, cautiouſly recommends the former, that he might not ſeem *'to caſt a ſnare* upon any Man; he *grants* p. 31. *a Vow raſhly undertaken to be a dangerous ſnare:* but how then will he defend his Church from the imputation of *laying this ſnare*, by the permiſſion and encouragement, ſhe gives her members to enter upon the monaſtic life in the flower of their age, whereas the ſame Apoſtle thought it expedient, for the prevention of theſe *ſnares*, to admit none into the order of Church-Widows till, having attain'd the age of ſixty, they might, in all human probability, be out of the reach of temptations to incontinency; and that this was his only motive to the preſcription of that age, notwithſtanding the little cavils of my Author p. 32. to the contrary, appears demonſtrably from the reaſon he gives *of refuſing the younger Widows;* the natural tendency of their inclinations to Marriage v. 11. But admit this, ſays the Diſcourſer, yet do's not the Apoſtle *preſcribe this age, as if any leſſer hath not a power of continency* &c: (that has been ſufficiently diſcuſs'd all along) *but becauſe the Church had not the ſame means to be aſſur'd of their inclinations,* as the Roman Church now has, I preſume, by the Spirit of infallibility; *and was much concern'd in her firſt growth, after the experience too of ſome miſcarriages, thus to prevent all ſcandal,* whilſt the Church of Rome, having now arriv'd at her maturity, thinks her ſelf no way concern'd to obviate thoſe ſcandals, at which the ears tingle, and the cheeks bluſh, of every honeſt member of her own Communion, *after the*

a 1 Cor. 7. 35.

experience

experience of miſcarriages in this kind, as heinous perhaps as thoſe, which pull'd down judgments, hot as the luſts that reign'd in them, upon *Sodom and Gomorrah*. *Later Church* then *upon experience of the chaſt behaviour of ſuch perſons*, exemplary, I preſume, at this day amongſt the jolly Monks in Spain, Portugal and Italy, *from the power of more diſcipline, due reſtraint &c.* (an admirable compliment to the Apoſtolic age of the Church) *thought not her ſelf oblig'd by this rule, fitted for the Apoſtle's days;* when a chaſt and pious life was a greater rarity amongſt Chriſtians, than it is in theſe bleſſed times of *Catholic* continency. *But as St. Paul from the lapſibility of younger Women* (thoſe careleſs naughty Women of his time, much better'd ſince) *admitted them at ſixty: ſo the 4th. general Council of Chalcedon, cum diligenti probatione*, (never practis'd in relation to Monaſtics) *admitted them at forty*. Pius the firſt Nuns at twenty five, one Canon at eighteen, and the generality of their Canons at fifteen, in ſhort then, 'tis not the practice of the latter ages of the Church in this matter, but a rational juſtification of the practice, we demand from him. I'e only acquaint him with St. Baſil's determination in this point, and then diſmiſs it. It is this: that, if we admit any into the number of Widows, (and I deſire to know a ſufficient diſparity of reaſon betwixt them and Monaſtics) under the age preſcrib'd by the Apoſtle, and they afterwards renounce their engagements by Marrying, 'tis not theirs, but our fault; as having violated the Apoſtolic conſtitutions, ſays Zonaras upon the place. And now after all this
§. 31. noiſe and zeal for the Monaſtic inſtitution, which my

[a] Can. 24. ad Amphylochium.

Author

Author has hitherto expreſs'd, the Reader will doubtleſs be ſurpriz'd to find him labouring under a ſick fit of Mind, and daſhing out, at laſt, the hitherto great buſineſs of his pen with one penitent ſtroke of it. Yet ſo it is; for, if, according to his own principles, *par.* 11. and, what is ſtronger, the nature of the thing, it be impoſſible, not difficult only, *at any one time ſo exactly to meaſure our own ſtrength, conſtancy, and ſtedfaſtneſs, as that we ſhall be aſſured of our ability to contain for the time to come; and if by the intervening of new temptations, there be no judgeing of our future by our preſent complexion,* then is it impoſſible for the wit of Man to defend the vowing of *perpetual* virginity, and the *Diſcourſer* has hitherto built Convents in the air. If, again, he *would counſel all men to marry*, who cannot attain to ſuch an exact *purity*, *as ſhall not be contaminated with any one uncleanneſs*, and affirms this beſides to be the Doctrine of the [a]Apoſtle; I would deſire him to reaſſume his work again, and *de novo* juſtify the practice of his Church upon theſe principles, flatly contradictory to what he has aſſerted *par.* 9. and, moreover, appeal even to himſelf, if, upon the following his advice in this place, all the Cloiſters in *Europe* would not preſently be depopulated. If, laſtly, they only *ſhall not be tempted above their power, who tempt not themſelves firſt*, and they only tempt not themſelves, who, by the ſteddineſs of their preſent reſolutions can be aſſured of their future perſeverance, as above; I deſire the Author only to reflect upon the ſequel of his own conceſſions, and reconcile them with the whole tenour and deſign of his precedent diſcourſe at his leiſure.

Par. 26.

Ibid.

See §. 7.

Ibid.

§. 32.

[a] 1 Cor. 7. 9.

par. 27. The drift of the next Paragraph, is, briefly, to account for the reaſons why the Apoſtle thought not fit to impoſe the Law of *Celibacy* upon the Clergy, and to juſtify the *Ch. of R.* notwithſtanding, in ſo doing. As to the firſt then, *He was loth to lay ſuch an hard burden on the tender ſhoulders of the infancy of the Ch. therefore nouriſh'd by him with milk, rather than ſtrong meat.* The very text urg'd by the Heretics in *Irenæus*, in juſtification of their pretentions to more perfect diſcoveries of the divine will, and more compleat diſcipline, than the Apoſtles left behind them; and upon the ſame ground, I preſume, it is, that we find nothing in St. *Paul* to countenance the infallibility of the *R. Ch.* the Supremacy of the Pope, and ſuch like luſcious novelties; alas *the ſqueamiſh ſtomach of the infant Ch.* was not able to digeſt ſuch *ſtrong meat,* ſuch nouriſhing food as theſe Doctrines would have afforded her. For ſhame! what groſs aſperſions will not ſome Men caſt upon the firſt, and beſt, Chriſtians in the world, when the practice and Doctrines of their times will not comport with thoſe of their own? and yet how greedily will they ſnatch the corruptions of after-ages to countenance and ſupport thoſe they maintain, from, and improve after them? But, 2*dly*, there was not then *ſo much choice of Paſtors*; nor, I anſwer, their flocks ſo numerous, and the one was in proportion to the other; *and they of neceſſity to be admitted to ſuch functions much ſooner than the Widows;* as if they were not ſo ſtill; and therefore how abſurdly do's this Man argue, from Celibacy impos'd upon the Ch. Widows at 60 to the conveniency of the like impoſition upon the Clergy at 24?

3*dly. Single life and Eunuchiſm was as yet, eſpecially to the Jew, a ſtrange propoſal;* Becauſe there was

was a confiderable Sect amongſt them, the *Eſſenes*, who practis'd it, and, whom the Diſciples, very probably had an eye to, when upon our [a] Savior's diſallowing divorce, unleſs in caſe of fornication, they pronounc'd it better, on thoſe terms, not to Marry. Upon theſe grounds then it was, that the [b] Apoſtle *reſtrain'd the Clergy only to one Wife*. But how do's it appear, that he confined them to one? *Chryſoſtom*, *Theodoret*, *Theophylact*, and even *Hierom* himſelf, in his Epiſtle to *Oceanus*, expound the words of St. *Paul*, as ſpoken only in oppoſition to the looſe cuſtom, amongſt the *Greeks* and *Romans*, but eſpecially the *Jews*, of Polygamy, and remarriages, after divorces upon whatſoever occaſions. And an Author, well known to this Diſcourſer, in his Annotations upon this place, is pleas'd to acknowledg; that, [c] *to marry a ſecond after the death of the firſt Wife ſeems not ſo very plainly prohibited to the Clergy*; obſerving farther that objection of *Tertullian* to the Orthodox Chriſtians, *Bigami præſident apud vos*; as likewiſe *Theodoret's defence of his ordination of Irenæus* (*a Bigamiſt in this ſenſe*) *Biſhop of Tyre, by the cuſtom of the Church in his epiſtle to Domnus; where he names three or four in that qualification ſo ordained. And tho' the Emperor cauſed Irenæus to be depoſed, for ſuſpicion of Neſtorianiſm, and Bigamy, as being ordained againſt the Canons; yet*, ſays he, *do'nt I find any thing done againſt Theodoret*. As for what this *Annotator*, ſo near allied to the *Diſcourſer*, objects, that, *the Apoſtle ſeeming here to propoſe a greater degree of chaſtity to the Ch. Governors than to other Chriſtians*, cannot be ſuppos'd to have prohibited them only

[a] Matt. 19. 10.
[b] 1 Tim. 3. 2, 12.
[c] A Paraph. and annot. on all St. Pauls epiſtles, Printed at the Theater in Oxford 1684.

the having two Wives at once, *which the Roman Laws* univerſally *forbad*; it is readily granted: for we affirm farther, that he here excludes them from the dignity of Biſhops (tho' not from the Society of Chriſtians) who ſhould remarry after unjuſt divorces, a practice allow'd by the Laws of the Roman Government; but yet grants them the liberty of ſecond, after the death of their firſt, Wives, which is all we contend for; ſuch a one ſtill continuing *the Husband of one Wife*, whereas remarrying upon a cauſeleſs divorce, he had been the Husband of two. From what has been ſaid then, it may appear by how wide a departure from the truly Apoſtolic Spirit, the Ch. in after-ages debarr'd thoſe, who had remarried, from her ſervice. And eſpecially the *Ch. of R.* which totally excludes Married people, unleſs upon condition of parting with their Wives, from all ſacred employments. And yet the rigorous Laws of this Ch. this Man undertakes to defend, upon theſe two Conſiderations; firſt, p. 38. that *St. Paul reſtraining the Clergy only to one Wife*, (which we have juſt now ſhown to be falſe) *obligeth them not to have a Wife, and that therefore the Ch. is left to her liberty* in this matter. *2dly, That ſhe hath power to eſtabliſh what the holy Scriptures no way prohibit*. Which two reaſonings, howſoever different in appearance, when examin'd, amount only to this, that in what caſe ſoever the Scriptures have not abſolutely *commanded* a thing to be done, as they have no where *commanded* the Clergy to Marry, there the Church has a power to *command* the direct contrary to be done, as, that the Clergy ſhall not Marry at all. To which 'tis anſwer'd, that where the thing left *uncommanded* by the Scriptures, is purely of an *indifferent* nature, which has no direct influence, in it ſelf, upon the Salvation or damnation of Man, there the Ch. has a power, diſcreetly

ſtill

ſtill to be managed, of *commanding* what the Scriptures have not; but in things of a laudable, or neceſſary kind, ſhe is bound up by the precedent which our Savior and his Apoſtles have ſet her, is obliged to *command* what they have *commanded*, and to *allow* what they have *allow'd*, eſpecially, where there remains ſtill the ſame reaſon for ſo doing; as there certainly do's in this caſe, unleſs they will pronounce the Primitive Paſtors of the Ch. more ſubject to incontinency, than their own, notwithſtanding the broadeſt experience & conviction to the contrary. Now the buſineſs of Marriage, tho' in regard of mankind, conjunctively conſider'd, *indifferent*, becauſe not abſolutely neceſſary to the whole *Species*, as ſuch, yet with reſpect to particular Perſons, *Clergy*, as well as *Laity*, who have not the gift of continency, it loſes that denomination, and muſt be rank'd amongſt the number of things requiſite to their Salvation, if the avoiding of fornication and uncleanneſs be ſuch; and cannot therefore lawfully be denied them by any human Autority. And I would deſire this *Diſcourſer* to inform me if, according to his poſition the Church may command the contrary of what the Scriptures have not *commanded*, but *allow'd* only, why ſhe may not, by the ſame reaſon, impoſe the Law of Celibacy upon all mankind, as well as upon the Clergy, ſince the Scriptures have no where univerſally enjoin'd the conjugal ſtate, no more then they have commanded it the Clergy. I ſhall not here ſtay to ſhew the injuſtice and nullity of this Law upon ſeveral other conſiderations as well as this of want of power in the *Legiſlator*; but ſhall remit the Reader to the learned Calixtus, if He has a mind to conſult him, for farther ſatisfaction in this matter. And after all will ſuppoſe, not grant, what this Author has all along ſo unſucceſsfully attempted to prove, that continency

§. 33.

a p. 102. 103. &c.

is univerſally attainable. Yet in the name of *Innocent the* 11 *th*, will *a bare poſſibility*, the bareſt in the World, juſtifie the eſtabliſhment of a Law, that ſhall oblige ſuch a number of men, upon the ſevereſt penalties, to it's performance? Do's God deal ſo with us? Or has He not rather made his Yoke eaſy, and his burden light, to all Chriſtians indifferently, and who then has the power to render them to any one Man, much leſs to ſo peculiar a body of Chriſtians, altogether difficult and unſupportable? The great Apoſtle, who has circumſcrib'd the power granted to the Paſtors of the Church, within the bounds of ſuch conſtitutions as ſhall tend [a] *to edification, only, not to deſtruction*, has ſeconded, & explain'd his doctrine by his own illuſtrious example in the very caſe now before us; for having indeed [b] commended *Celibacy* as a ſtate that frees us from thoſe troubles & anxieties, to which the *conjugal* condition is accidentally obnoxious, He is ſo far from enjoining it to any order of Chriſtians, that, on the contrary, to prevent ſuch a dangerous miſtake, He qualifies his Diſcourſe with an open declaration of his intentions in it, that He had ſaid ſo much [c] *for their own profit* only, *and not that He might caſt a ſnare upon them*; i. e. that He might not be thought to lay any neceſſary obligation upon any Man to embrace it. And this moderation and tenderneſs of the Apoſtle in this caſe is ſo very conſpicuous, that it could not eſcape the obſervation of my *Author* Himſelf, who not only grants, that He *proceeded tenderly in this point, and with cautious and ſuſpended ſteps*, but gives very good reaſons for his ſo doing; the *extreme difficulty of attaining the act and exerciſe of continency and purity, above any other matter of a vow whatſoever, and the abominableneſs of the ſin which the undiſcreet attempters thereof fall into, if they miſcarry.*

See par. 25. p. 33.

par. 25.

a 2 Cor. 13. 10. b 1 Cor. 7. 32. &c. c Ibid. v. 35.

carry. And would not one be amaz'd, after all this, to find it the ſole buſineſs of this Writer to defend the rigorous injunction of Celibacy to the Clergy upon a (purely ſuppos'd, not prov'd) bare poſſibility of the thing? certainly He muſt needs have figur'd to Himſelf, either, that the prudential tenderneſs of St. *Paul* is no fit precedent for the ſucceſſor of St. *Peter* to follow; or, that the *Roman* mightily out-ſtrips the old *Apoſtolic* Clergy in the virtue of a chaſt and continent behaviour, notwithſtanding the loud and repeated complaints of their notorious debaucheries by ſeveral eminent Members of that Communion. I confeſs 'tis ſcarce fit the lewd practiſes of ſome people ſhould be *once nam'd* amongſt men of true Piety and Religion; yet ſince theſe Gentlemen are pleas'd to urge the marriage of our Clergy as a popular argument to the undiſtinguiſhing heads of the Vulgar, againſt us; I think my ſelf oblig'd, in juſtice to the cauſe I maintain, not to diſmiſs this argument with out ſome repreſentation of the diſmal effects of this Law amongſt them, from ſeveral eminent pens of their own Church, that ſo the Reader may judge betwixt us, and this people.

I might juſtly then commence my enquiries into the deplorable conſequences of this impoſition as high as the firſt attempts towards it; of which the Epiſtle of *Udalricus*, Biſhop of *Auguſta* in *Germany*, to Pope *Nicolas* the firſt, about the year 860, is an Authentic teſtimony, as well as a ſolid confutation of the Celibacy; but ſince *Hildebrand*, who as He was the firſt that gave the finiſhing ſtroke to the Empire of the *Roman* Pontif, ſo the firſt likewiſe, who compleated the impoſition of the Celibacy upon the Clergy of the *Weſtern* Church, I ſhall chuſe rather to date the pernicious effects of this Law, and the complaints of good Men in relation to both, from his days only. In the 12*th* Century then, §. 34

the

the age immediately ſucceeding that of *Hildebrand*, we find St. [a] *Bernard*, in the higheſt ſtrain of indignation and eloquence, complaining of the fornications, adulteries, inceſts, and the unnatural beſtialities of Men with Men, reigning in the ſacred orders, and all theſe enormities charg'd upon ſome mens inabilitie to contain, and yet raſhly thruſting themſelves into the ſervice of the Church, where marriage was denied them. So great a
p. 38. *means* was this Law *to make many more Zealous of this excellent gift*, which, in the ſence of this Father, they could not attain. [b] *Radulphus de Diceto*, Dean of *Paul's*, in the ſame age, complains that never did any Hereſy make ſuch a rupture in the Church as this inconſiderate action of *Hildebrand*; that very few preſerv'd continency, others barely pretended to it out of vain glory, and for preferment's-ſake; and that a great many, laſtly, ſuperadded to their incontinencies, perjuries and manifold adulteries. [c] *Durandus*, in the 13*th* Century, having complain'd of the public ſtews ſuffer'd under the very noſes of the *Roman* Prelates, and of the *Pope* Himſelf, ſuggeſting farther the profit, ſome of his Holineſſe's Officers made of them, propoſes it, in [d] another place, as a ſubject worthy the conſideration of the Church, ſince all attempts hitherto for the preſervation of the continency of the Clergy had prov'd unſucceſsful, whether or no it might not be expedient, that the *Roman* Church, in this particular, ſhould form Her ſelf upon the model of the *Eaſtern*, eſpecially ſince their conſtitution, in this caſe, was, as he ſaies, abſerv'd in the Apoſtolic age. *Alvarus Pelagius*, a Portugal Biſhop, in the 14*th* Century, in his known Book *de planctu Eccleſiæ*, amongſt other crying ſins of the *Roman* Clergy of his days, laments peculiarly their incontinency, wiſhing that the Spaniards and Regricolæ eſpe-

[a] L. de converſione ad Clericos c. 20.
[b] See Decem Scriptores. *pag.* 486.
[c] L. de modo celebrandi generalis concilii, parte 2. tit. 10.
[d] Ibid. tit. 46.
[e] L. 2. art. 27.

ci-

cially, had never promis'd continency: the Children of the Clergy being, in thoſe Countries, ſays he, more numerous than thoſe of the Laity; and what is more deteſtable, for ſeveral years together from their Concubines beds they go ſtrai to the Altar. In another place [a] He complains of their debauching the Women, who came to confeſſion. And in a [b] third, that in *Spain*, *Aſturia*, and *Gallicia* chiefly, they ſometimes promiſe, and ſwear, by the intervention of a public inſtrument to that purpoſe, to keep their Miſtreſſes as long as they live, eſpecially if they be perſons of quality, ſolemnizing the contract with entertainments, convention of friends and relations, and ſuch like ceremonies, cuſtomary at a Lawful marriage. [c] *Holkot*, who liv'd in the ſame age, a Dominican by profeſſion, and by birth an Engliſh Man, ſtiles the Prieſts of his days Prieſts of *Priapus* and *Baalpheor*. In the 13*th*. Century Concubinage was grown ſo common, that it had almoſt exchang'd it's name of ſin for that of a ſport or diverſion; *Gerſon* [d] owns it ſo rooted and epidemical an evil, that, as things ſtood (under the reign of Celibacy) if Prieſts were not permitted the uſe of common Women, they would, in ſeveral places fall upon the Wives and Daughters of their Pariſhioners. What a ſtrange thing is it, ſays *Nicolaus de Clemangis* [e], that in ſeveral Dioceſes now a days the Rectors of Pariſhes bargain with their Biſhops for licence to keep Concubines? and in an other place [f]: what need I tell you a long ſtory of Chaplains and Canons, when I may comprize their character in one word, that they are of the ſame complexion with the Biſhops, ignorant *&c.* But exceſſively incontinent, maintaining a ſpurious brood, and Whores inſtead of Wives, in their own houſes. *Petrus de Alliaco*, Cardinal of Cambray, in his

[a] Art. 14. [b] Art. 53. ſee likewiſe l. 2. fol. 28. and cap. 28. [c] Lect. in Sapientiam 138. [d] De vita Spirituali animæ lect. 4. corol. 14. propoſ. 3ª. [e] De corrupto ſtatu Eccleſiæ. c. 23. [f] c. 30.

Tract concerning the Reformation of the Church, adviſes in an eſpecial manner, to the obviating that ſcandalous cuſtom, or rather corruption, as he juſtly calls it, amongſt the Eccleſiaſtics, of publicly keeping Concubines. Another of the ſame high character, and a great light of the Law, [a] *Panormitan*, gives his opinion, that the Ch. not only has power to introduce the Greek Conſtitution in relation to the Marriage of the Clergy, but affirms it conducive to the ſalvation of Mens Souls, from the experience of the lew'd and diſſolute lives of thoſe under the tyranny of the Celibate; and thinks, therefore, that the Church, like a good Phyſician, ſhould apply that remedy no longer, which ſhe finds deſtructive, rather than beneficial, to the patient. Add to theſe the judgment of a 3*d* Cardinal, *Æneas Sylvius*, afterwards Pope Pius the 2[d]. who, as Platina reports of him, was of opinion, that as there were reaſons for interdicting marriage to the Clergy, ſo much greater reaſon to reſtore it them. And in his relation of the [b] Tranſactions of the Council of Baſil, plainly diſcovers, he had the ſame ſenſe of this matter, tho under another's Perſon, whom he introduces ſpeaking thus. *Perhaps it might not be inconvenient that ſeveral Prieſts were allow'd the liberty of Marriage, becauſe many would be ſav'd in a conjugal Prieſthood, who are damn'd in a barren Presbytery.* *Sigiſmund* the Emperor, in a form of Reformation of the Clergy to be offer'd to the Council of Baſil, commanded this head to be inſerted amongſt the reſt; that ſince there had enſued more harm than good from the decree of Calixtus, it was better, and ſafer for the Souls of Men, that, according to the Conſtitution of the Oriental Church, the Clergy might be permitted to Marry. This Century I ſhall cloſe with the teſtimony of *Polydore Virgil*, who liv'd near the end of it.

He then, in his book [c] *de rerum inventoribus*, delivers his

a C. cum olim de cler. conjug. b L. 2. in fin. c. lib. 5. c. 4.

his ſenſe of the Celibate thus: *This I muſt ſay, that forced Chaſtity, has been ſo far from outdoing the conjugal, that no ſin has brought greater diſgrace upon the order, greater evil to Religion, more greif to all good Men, than the luſt of the Clergy. And therefore perhaps it might be ſerviceable as to the Chriſtian Common-wealth in general, ſo to that order of men in it, that the right of public marriage were at laſt reſtored them.*

In the 16*th* Century we find the like complaints ſtill continued: *Johannes Chiemenſis* in his [a] *Onus Eccleſiæ*, proteſts, *that of the Prophet* [b] *Ezechiel was verified in the Prelates, of his days: Son of Man haſt thou ſeen, what the Ancients of the houſe of Iſrael do in the dark, every man in the Chambers of his imagery? for they ſay the Lord ſeeth us not*, &c. and in another place: [c] *The Prieſts* ſays He, *are frequently polluted with fornications, they, who have the Cure of Souls eſpecially are guilty of ſo notorious Concubinage, that it will admit of no ſecreſie, nor palliation.* Paul the Third's ſelect Council of Cardinals and Biſhops for the Reformation of the Church own *that public proſtitutes rode in ſtate through the City of Rome upon their mules, attended at noon day with numerous crowds of the Nobility and Clergy.* Which ſort of Cattle when Pius the 5*th*, [d] a Pope of ſevere morals, thought of driveing out of the City; He was forc'd to quit his deſign, upon this ſuggeſtion, that it was mightily to be fear'd, leaſt ſo many ſingle perſons being altogether depriv'd of the uſe of women, might be tempted to the commiſſion of a more ſcandalous ſin, which St. *Paul* had formerly charg'd upon the *Romans*. When, again, He had thoughts at leaſt of confineing them to their habitations, the Senate of the City, at the ſecret inſtigations of the Clergy, who durſt not publickly appear in't, interpoſed at firſt by a repreſentation of the great danger, the chaſtity of the Ladies would

[a] C 21. [b] C. 8. v. 12. [c] c. 23. [d] Thuan hiſt. l. 30.

would ſtill be in amongſt ſo many Gentlemen of the Celibate, unleſs the proſtitutes were indulged their former liberty. Admirable continency! To theſe I might add, at large, the repeated inſtances of *Ferdinand the firſt, Maximiliam the ſecond, Sigiſmund King of Poland*, and *of Albert Duke of Bavaria*, to Paul the fourth, and Pius the fourth, as well after, as dureing the ſeſſion, of the Council of Trent, by their Orators, and Letters, that the Clergy might be permitted to marry. That *Caſſander* and *Wicelius*, conſulted by the two forementiond Emperors, and commanded to deliver their judgment about an accommodation of Religious differences, were perfectly of this opinion, is a known thing: *Cornelius Epiſcopus Bitontinus*, in an oration before the Council of Trent, tragically repreſenting the corruptions of this kind, that reign'd in the Church, exhorts the Fathers to begin their Reformation from the houſe of God, if there was any ſenſe of modeſty, any hopes of amendment left. [a] *Eſpencæus*, likewiſe preſent at the Council, cryes ſhame of that execrable cuſtom of indulging concubinage to profeſſors of continency at a ſet annual rate; aſſuring us, that amongſt the vaſt numbers of delinquents in this kind, few or none ſuffer any other puniſhment than that of the pocket. [b] *Suarez* appeals to daily experience to atteſt, that the Church admits thoſe into orders, who deſign nothing leſs than a continent life, ſeveral candidates for Orders entertaining at the ſame time Strumpets in their houſes. To theſe I might add the teſtimonies and loud complaint of [c] *Alfonſus a Caſtro*, who tells us that if they ſhould attempt to conceal the incontinency of the Preiſthood, their own Children would proclaim it; of [d] *Aventinus*, who affirms their ſalacity to have become proverbial; of *Pereſius*, who wiſhes a relaxation of the Law of Celibacy

l. 5. c. 3.

a In 1 cap. Ep. ad Titum. b L. 1. de voto c. 4. c L. 3. de hæreticorum punitione. d L. 3. Annal Boior. p. 211. & l. 5. p. 460.

as

as neceſſary to the avoiding fornication and ſcandal; of [a] *Albertus Pighius* and [b] *Dominicus Soto* themſelves, moſt ſtrenuous aſſerters of the Celibate, who yet cannot diſſemble the lewdneſs it occaſions. But I ſhall ſhut up this argument with a teſtimony beyond all exception, and that is, of the aſſembly of the Princes and Nobility of the Empire at *Norimberg*, who, amongſt other greivances of which they deſired *Germany* might be eas'd, make likewiſe this heavy complaint; [c] 'that *the Officials receive yearly penſions from the Clergy, and Religious for allowing them publickly to keep Concubines, which practice with how great ſcandal, danger, and damage to both Soul and Body it is attended, need not be rehearſed, ſince every one is ſenſible of it.* Again; *in ſeveral places the Biſhops and their Officials not only tolerate the Concubinage of Prieſts, provided they pay for it, but they oblige likewiſe thoſe, who live continently, to the ſame tax, alleging the Biſhops need of Money, which once paid, they are left to their liberty to whore, or live chaſt, as they pleaſe. What an accurſed thing this is there's none but underſtands.* Thus they. To all which I might add the notorious inſtances of the unchaſt Celibate of ſeveral of their Popes themſelves; as of Paul the ſecond, Sixtus the fourth, Innocent the eight, Alexander the ſixth (a meer monſter of a Man) Julius the ſecond, Leo the tenth, Paul the third, Julius the third *&c.* But I will not rake any farther into kennels; the Reader, I hope, without any more of that nauſeous labour, is, by this time, ſatisfied of what I principally aim'd at in theſe authentic teſtimonies, the diſmal conſequences of the Celibate, the ſentiments of pious men of their own Communion about it, and the high and moſt unchriſtian injuſtice of continuing ſtill to impoſe that yoke upon thoſe, who, from its firſt commencement to

[a] Controv. 15. [b] L. 7. de juſt. qu. 6. a. 1. [c] Gravam 75. & 91.

this day, have not been able to beare it, nor ever will to the end of the World. All which conſiderations laid together, naturally put a Man's thoughts upon enquiring after the true and fundamental reaſon of the inflexible continuance of this Law in the Roman Church. And theſe two ſeem very eaſily to offer themſelves to our conſideration. Firſt, the neceſſary conſequence of the bold pretence of infallibility, which will not ſuffer them to recede from an error once eſtabliſh'd; and ſecondly, and more eſpecially, the policy of that Ch. (the true parent of moſt of her Doctrines and Conſtitutions) in keeping ſo conſiderable a body of Men, by means of the ſingle life, from any near obligations and endearments to their reſpective Countries, which the enjoyment of legal iſſue would, above all things, be apt to draw after it; that ſo they may have more intire and cloſer dependance upon the Apoſtolic chair, and be better prepared to execute any pious deſigns of his Holineſs upon their own Countrey, when he has occaſion for their ſervice.

§. 35. There remains but one topic more to be ſpoke to in anſwer to this diſcourſe, and that is what latitude ſome Doctors of His Church allow to Fornication in thoſe, who, by Vow, or Law of the Church are prohibited marriage. And his opinion, firſt, is, that if people *after vows will not contain* (*ſuppoſing no Eccleſiaſtical Law to intervene, which may render Marriage to ſuch, when contracted, invalid, as not to be a Marriage*) *they ſin much leſs in marrying, Than in Fornication, or uncleanneſs*; but then in caſe of the intervention of ſuch Law, and, which He knows, do's in this caſe actually intervene, it muſt be his ſentiment, that they ſin more in marrying, tho' that Act be render'd invalid only by an humane Law, than they do in promiſcuous luſt, *a thing* p. 38. *eternally unlawful, as being againſt God's command.* So little

little has this Author attended to the neceſſary conſequences of his own ſubtilties, encourageing Men to Act againſt the Law of God, rather than their own, even whilſt He pretends to teach the contrary doctrine. But 'tis no wonder to find men contradicting themſelves, who contradict the Laws of God firſt. But 'tis fit, after all, that the looſneſs of ſome of their Caſuiſts in this matter ſhould be tolerably palliated; and therefore, I preſume, it is, that He concludes thus. *And if ſome, in compareing marriage with ſome one Act of Fornication or uncleaneſs, may affirm the firſt to be more oppoſite to a vow than the latter; as rendering one uncapable of obſerving his vow at all for the future, which the latter doth not: yet in this all well agree, that even to a votary the living in marriage, than living in continual Fornication, or other uncleanneſs, is a life to God leſs offenſive.* A noble conceſſion! and which yet they cannot make (nor my Author himſelf according to the conſequences of his Doctrine above) who, holding the marriage of votaries invalid, muſt hold every ſuch conjugal Act, an Act of Fornication, and, conſequently are obliged to prefer *continual Fornication* without marriage to that *continual Fornication* they, in this caſe, ſuppoſe to attend it, the former not being a direct infringment of their vow, which the latter is. But, to go on, do's [a] *Coſter's* Doctrine extend it ſelf only to *one Act of Fornication*? who teaches, that, *if a Prieſt Fornicate, or keep a Concubine at home, tho' he be guilty of greivous Sacriledg, yet ſins more greivouſly if he marry*; unleſs indeed my Author will ſuppoſe that a Preiſt keeps a Concubine for *ſome one Act of Fornication?* What thinks He of [b] *Matthias Aquenſis*, who declares a Votary *more culpable for marrying, than for Acts of humane frailty*, as He ſtiles them, *with an hundred* p. 38. & 39.

a De Celib. Sacerdo'. propoſ. 9. b In præcipuos Buceri errores.

diffe-

different perſons? What thinks He of the excellent determination of Cardinal Campegius, who, upon a diſpute that happen'd at *Strasburg* about the puniſhment of ſome Prieſts, who had committed Matrimony, when the cauſe was carried before Him; poſitively averr'd, that *it was a greater crime in a Prieſt to marry, than to keep ſeveral Whores in his houſe*; (*for one Act of Fornication* I ſuppoſe) and this notwithſtanding the repreſentation made to Him by the Senate of the place, of the ſcandalous debaucheries of their Clergy, in excuſe of the Criminals, as [a] *Sleidan* reports the ſtory? what thinks He, in ſhort, of their old Gloſs upon [b] Gratian, *Communiter dicitur*, &c. *it is the common opinion that a Clerk ought not to be depoſed for ſimple Fornication*; and that for this reaſon, in [c] another gloſs, *becauſe there are but few* (of the Clergy) *who are not guilty of that vice.* a comfortable opinion indeed, and weighty reaſons to ſupport it, and, to ſpeak in the profane ſtrain of a late Grammaticaſter, an admirable expedient for *propagating the faith, and multiplying the Catholic party.*

[a] L. 4. [b] Diſtinct. 18. Maximilianus. [c] Ad canonem *Qui admiſit*. Cauſa 15. quæſt. 6.

FINIS.

THE CONTENTS.

Whether it be truly affirm'd by the Author *of the late* Diſcourſe about Celibacy, *That the* Single State *has the advantage of the* Married *as to all* Acts of Piety and Devotion. Page 1.

Particularly as to the point of Charity. p. 4.

Of the Purity *of* Body *in the* Virgin, *above that of the* Married ſtate. p. 5, 6.

Whether Celibacy *be in its ſelf more* perfect, *and worthy of a* greater reward *than a* Married ſtate? p. 9.

It do's not at all follow, that if God *gives men power to* contain, *where the Uſe of* Marriage *unavoidably hindred, or by* God *himſelf prohibited; therefore he will give it to all thoſe who raſhly* impoſe ſuch a neceſſity upon themſelves. p. 10, 11.

The difference between this Author *and St.* Paul *as to the* point, Whether it be not better to Marry than to burn. p. 11, 12.

That all men cannot contain p. 13.

The Arguments *to the* contrary *conſidered.* p. 16, 17.

The ill Conſequences *of the* one *and* other Opinion *compared.* p. 23.

The Authority *of* Scripture, *as to this matter*, Examined; *and whether it appear from thence that all may have the* Gift of Continency. p. 24.

The Contrary *ſhewn from thence.* p. 29.

That the Primitive Councils and Fathers *concur with the* H. Scripture *as to this particular.* p. 32.

This Author's *Argument for the* Univerſality *of this* Gift, *from the practice of* Antiquity, *Conſider'd; and his own proofs turn'd upon Him.* p. 33.

Whether the Doctrine *of the* Church *of* Rome *in this* point, *be not that* Doctrine of Devils *of which S.* Paul *ſpeaks*, 1 Tim. IV. 4, 5. p. 59.

The Point *of* Antiquity *pursued, and his remaining* Reflections *on this occasion answer'd.* p. 65.

That no good Argument *can be drawn from* Reason *to presume upon* God's *Assistance, for the performance of a* Vow *of* Celibacy. p. 71.

That the encouragements offer'd for such a Vow, *are no way to be approved.* p. 74.

The Discoursers *Answers to the* Texts *of* Scriptures *against such* Vows *consider'd.* p. 75.

His Reason *examin'd, why the* Apostle *thought not fit to establish any such* Law *of* Celibacy, *as the* Church *of* Rome *now observes.* p. 82.

The sad Effects which this Restraint *has had upon many of the* Romish Votaries; *shewn from the* Complaints *of those of their own* Church. p. 87.

How great a Latitude *those who deny* Marriage, *allow to* Fornication. p. 94.

Texts

TEXTS of SCRIPTURE EXPLAINED.

	Chap.	Verſ.	Pag.
Exod.	19.	15.	6.
1 Sam.	21.	4.	
Matth.	19.	10, 11, 12.	2, 27, 29, 31, 73, 78.
		20.	83.
		21, 23.	22.
		26.	13, 14.
Luk.	18.	28.	24.
1 Cor.	7.	1, &c.	2.
		5.	7. 49.
		7.	21, 29, 33, 73.
		9.	26, 67, 77.
		17.	21.
		25, &c.	13.
		32.	86.
		35.	79, 86.
		36.	28, 37, 38.
		39.	26.
1 Cor.	12.	4, 5, 6.	21.
1 Tim.	3.	2, 11, 12.	8, 47, 64, 83.
	4.	4, 5.	59, 63.
	5.	11, 12, 14.	24, 25, 75.
Tit.	1.	6.	47.

ERRATA.

P.	L.	
6.	10.	For *us* r. *up.*
8.	19.	for *this* r. *his.*
9.	2.	before *even* add *and.*
	3.	dele *as.*
12.	6.	after *put* add *it.*
13.	30.	for *in* r. *is.*
14.	32.	before *because* add *which.*
	33.	in the Note for 9. r. 19.
30.	11.	after *did* add *not.*
32.	4.	in the Notes r. *capiunt.*
71.	2.	for *Juſtin* r. *Peter.*
89.	5.	for *Strai* r. *Strait.*
95.	14.	for *well* r. *will.*

The Miſpointings not here taken notice of, the Reader is deſired to Amend.

Books Pinted for Richard Chiſwell.

Dr. *Cave's* Lives of the Primitive Fathers, in 2. Vol. *Folio.*
Dr. *Cary's* Chronological Account of Ancient Time. *fol.*
Hooker's Eccleſiaſtical Polity. *fol.*
Sir *John Burlace's* Hiſtory of the Iriſh Rebellion. *fol.*
The Laws of this Realm concerning Jeſuits, Seminary Prieſts, Recuſants, the Oaths of Supremacy and Allegiance, explained by divers Judgments and Reſolutions of the *Judges*; with other Obſervations thereupon. By *William Cawley*, Eſq; *fol.*
Dr. *Tuerſon's* Explication on the Creed, the Commandments, and Lords Prayer, in 3 Vol. *fol.*
Biſhop *Nicholſon* on the Church-Catechiſm.
Dr. *John Cave's* ſeven occaſional Sermons. 4*to.*
Biſhop *Wilkins* Natural Religion. 8*o.*
—— His Fifteen Sermons. 8*o.*
Mr. Tanners Primordia: Or the Riſe and Growth of the firſt Church of God deſcribed. 8*o.*
Spaniards Conſpiracy againſt the State of *Venice.* 8*o.*
Dr. *Caves* Primitive Chriſtianity, in three parts. 8*o.*
Certain genuine Remains of the Lord *Bacon*, in Arguments Civil, Moral, Natural, &c. with a large account of all his Works. By Dr. *Tho. Tenijon.* 8*o.*
Dr. *Henry Beghaws* Diſcourſes on ſelect Texts 8*o.*
Mr. *Fullers* State of the Church in the three firſt Centuries.
Dr. *Burnets* Account of the Life and Death of the Earl of *Rocheſter.* 8*o.*
—— Hiſtory of the Rights of Princes in the diſpoſing of Eccleſiaſtical Benefices and Church-lands. 8*o.*
—— Relation of the preſent ſtate of the difference between the *French* King and the Court of *Rome*; to which is added, the Popes Brief to the Aſſembly of the Clergy, and their Proteſtation, publiſhed by Dr. *Burnet.* 8*o.*
Dr. *Combers* Companion to the Altar. 8*o.*
Dr. *Sherlocks* Practical Diſcourſe of Religious Aſſemblies. 8*o.*
—— Defence of Dr. *Stillingfleets* Unreaſonableneſs of Separation. 8*o.*
—— A Vindication of the Defence of Dr. *Stillingfleet*, in anſwer to Mr. *Baxter* and Mr. *Lob* about Catholick Communion. 8*o.*
Sir *Rob. Filmers Patriarcha*, or natural Power of Kings. 8*o.*
Biſhop *Wettenhalls* method and order for private devotion. 24*o.*
Valentines private devotions. 4*o.*
Dr. *Spencer de Legibus Hebræorum Ritualibus & earum Rationibus, fol.*
Dr. *John Lightfoots* Works in *Engliſh*, in 2 Vol. *fol.*
Sir *Tho. Brownes* Vulgar Errors, with all the reſt of his Works, *fol.*
Petrii Simonii Diſquiſitiones Criticæ de Variis per diverſa Loca & Tempora Bibliorum Editionibus. Accedunt Caſtig. Opuſc. If. Voſſii de Sybil. Oracc. 4*o.*
The Caſe of Lay-Communion with the Church of *England* conſidered, 4*o.*
Two Letters betwixt Mr. *R. Smith*, and Dr. *Hen. Hammond* about Chriſts deſcent into Hell, 8*o.*
Dean *Stratfords* Diſſwaſive from Revenge, 8*o.*

Dr.

Dr. *Hen. Burtons* firſt Volume of Diſcourſes, of Purity and Charity; of Repentance, and of ſeeking the Kingdom of God. Publiſhed by Dean *Tillotſon*. 8o.

——His Second Volume of Diſcourſes on ſeveral Practical Subjects. 8o.

Sir *Thomas Mores Utopia*, newly made Engliſh by Dr. *Burnet*. 8o.

Mr. *Sellers* Devout Communicant; aſſiſted with Rules, Meditations, Prayers and Anthems, 12.

Dr. *Towerſon* of the Sacraments in General.

—— Of the Sacrament of Baptiſm in particular. 8o.

The Hiſtory of the *COUNCIL of TRENT*; in which, beſides the ordinary Acts of the Council, are declared many notable occurrences which hapned in Chriſtendom for 40 Years, and particularly the Practices of the *COURT* of *ROME* to hinder the *Reformation of their Errors*, and to maintain *Their Greatneſs*; Written by *Father Paul* of the *Servi*. To which is added, the *Life* of the *Author*, and the *Hiſtory* of the *Inquiſition*.

Dr. *Burnets* Hiſtory of the Reformation of the Church of *Eng.* in 2 Vol. *Fol.*

A Collection of ſixteen ſeveral Tracts and Diſcourſes, written in the Years, from 1678, to 1685. inclufive; by *Gilbert Burnet*, D. D. To which is added, A Letter written to Dr. *Burnet*, giving an Account of Cardinal *Pools* ſecret Powers. The Hiſtory of the *Powder-Treaſon*, with a Vindication of the Proceedings thereupon. An Impartial Conſideration of the Five Jeſuits dying Speeches, who were Executed for the Popiſh Plot, 1679. 4o.

A Diſſertation concerning the Government of the *Ancient Church*; more particularly of the Encroachments of the *Biſhops of Rome* upon other *Sees*, By *WILLIAM CAVE*, D. D. 8vo.

An Anſwer to Mr. *Serjeant's* [Sure Footing in Chriſtianity] concerning the Rule of Faith: With ſome other Diſcourſes. By *WILLIAM FALKNER*, D. D. 4o.

A Vindication of the Ordinations of the *Church of England*; in Anſwer to a Paper written by one of the *Church of Rome*, to prove the Nullity of our Orders. By *GILBERT BURNET*, D. D.

An Abridgment of the Hiſtory of the Reformation of the *Church of England*, By *GILB. BURNET*, D. D. 8vo.

The APOLOGY of the *Church of England*; and an Epiſtle to one Signior *Scipio*, a *Venetian* Gentleman, concerning the Council of *Trent*. Written both in Latin, by the Right Reverend Father in God, *JOHN JEWEL* Lord Biſhop of *Salisbury*; Made Engliſh by a Perſon of Quality. To which is added, The Life of the ſaid Biſhop; Collected and written by the ſame Hand, 8vo.

The Life of *WILLIAM BEDEL*, D. D. Biſhop of *Kilmore* in *Ireland*. Together with *Certain Letters* which paſſed betwixt him and *James Waddeſworth* (a late Penſioner of the Holy Inquiſition of *Sevil*) in Matters of Religion, concerning the General Motives to the *Roman Obedience*. 8vo.

The Decree made at *ROME* the Second of *March*, 1679. condemning ſome Opinions of the *Jeſuits*, and other *Caſuiſts*. 4o.

A Diſcourſe concerning the Neceſſity of Reformation, with reſpect to the Errors and Corruptions of the *Church of Rome*. 4o. Firſt and Second Parts.

A Diſcourſe concerning the Celebration of Divine Service in an Unknown Tongue. 4o.

A Papiſt not Miſrepreſented by Proteſtants. Being a Reply to the Reflections upon the Anſwer to [A Papiſt Miſrepreſented and Repreſented] 4o.

An Expoſition of the Doctrine of the *Church of England*, in the ſeveral Articles propoſed by the late BISHOP of *CONDOM*, [in his Expoſition of the Doctrine of the *Catholick Church*] 4o.

Defence of the Expoſition of the Doctrine of the *Church of England*; againſt the Exceptions of Monſ. *de Meaux*, late Biſhop of *Condom*, and his Vindicator. 4o.

A *CATECHISM* explaining the Doctrine and Practices of the *Church of Rome*. With an Anſwer thereunto. By a *Proteſtant* of the *Church of England*. 8vo.

A Papiſt Repreſented and not Miſrepreſented, being an Anſwer to the Firſt, Fifth and Sixth Sheets of the Second Part of the [Papiſt Miſrepreſented and not Repre-

Repreſented]; and for a further Vindication of the *CATECHISM*, truly Repreſenting the Doctrines and Practices of the *Church of Rome*. 4o.

The *Lay-Chriſtian's* Obligation to read the Holy Scriptures. 4o.

The *Plain man's* Reply to the *Catholick Miſſionaries*. 24o.

An Anſwer to *THREE PAPERS* lately printed, concerning the Authority of the *Catholick Church* in matters of Faith, and the Reformation of the *Ch. of Eng.* 4o.

A Vindication of the Anſwer to the ſaid THREE PAPERS. 4o.

Mr. *Chillingworths* Book, called [*The Religion of Proteſtants a ſafe way to Salvation*] made more generally uſeful by omitting perſonal conteſts, but inſerting whatſoever concerns the common cauſe of *Proteſtants*, or defends the *Church of England*; with an exact Table of Contents, and an Addition of ſome genuine Pieces of Mr. *Chillingworths*, never before Printed, *viz.* againſt the *Infallibility* of the *Roman* Church, *Tranſubſtantiation*, *Tradition*, &c. And an Account of what moved the Author to turn Papiſt, with his confutation of the ſaid motives.

An Hiſtorical Treatiſe written by an Author of the *Communion* of the *Church of Rome*, touching *Tranſubſtantiation*. Wherein is made appear, That according to the Principles of *that Church*, this Doctrine cannot be an Article of Faith. 4o.

The Proteſtants Companion, or an Impartial ſurvey, and compariſon of the *Proteſtant Religion* as by Law eſtabliſhed, with the main *Doctrines of Popery*. Wherein is ſhewn, that Popery is contrary to Scripture, Primitive Fathers and Councils; and that proved from Holy Writ, the Writings of the Ancient Fathers, for ſeveral hundred Years, and the Confeſſion of the moſt Learned Papiſts themſelves. 4o.

The Pillar and Ground of Truth. A Treatiſe ſhewing that the *Roman Church* falſly claims to be *that Church*, and the Pillar of *that Truth* mentioned by *S. Paul* in his firſt Epiſtle to *Timothy*, *chap.* 3. *ver.* 15. 4o.

The Peoples Right to read the Holy Scriptures Aſſerted. 4o.

A ſhort ſummary of the principal Controverſies between the Church of *Engl.* and the Church of *Rome*, being a Vindication of ſeveral Proteſtant Doctrines, in Anſwer to a late Pamphlet, intituled, [*Proteſtancy deſtitute of Scripture proofs*] 4o.

An Anſwer to a late Pamphlet, intituled, [The Judgment and Doctrine of the Clergy of the Church of *England* concerning one ſpecial Branch of the Kings Prerogative, viz. [*In diſpenſing with the Penal Laws.*] 4o.

A Diſcourſe of the *Holy Euchariſt* in the two great Points of the *Real Preſence*, and the *Adoration of the Hoſt*; in Anſwer to the *Two Diſcourſes* lately Printed at *Oxford* on this Subject: To which is prefixed a large Hiſtorical Preface relating to the ſame Argument.

Two Diſcourſes; Of Purgatory, and Prayers for the Dead.

The Fifteen *Notes* of the *Church*, as laid down by Cardinal *Bellarmin* examined and confuted. 4o. With a Table to the Whole.

Preparation for Death: Being a Letter ſent to a young Gentlewoman in *France*, in a dangerous Diſtemper of which ſhe died. By *W. Wake*, M. A. 12o.

The Difference between the *Church of England* and the *Church of Rome*, in oppoſition to a late Book, Intituled, *An Agreement between the Church of* England *and Church of* Rome.

A *Private Prayer* to be uſed in difficult Times.

A True Account of a Conference held about Religion at *London*, *Sept.* 29. 1687. between *A. Pulton*, Jeſuit, and *Th. Tenniſon*, D. D. as alſo of that which led to it, and followed after it. 4o.

The Vindication of *A. Creſſener*, Schoolmaſter in *Long-Acre*, from the Aſperſions of *A. Pulton*, Jeſuit, Schoolmaſter in the *Savoy*, together with ſome Account of his Diſcourſe with Mr. *Meredith*.

A Diſcourſe ſhewing that Proteſtants are on the ſafer Side, notwithſtanding the uncharitable Judgment of Adverſaries; and that *Their Religion* is the ſureſt Way to Heaven. 4o.

Six Conferences concerning the *Euchariſt*, wherein is ſhewed, that the Doctrine of *Tranſubſtantiation* overthrows the Proofs of Chriſtian Religion.

A Diſcourſe concerning the pretended Sacrament of *Extreme Unction*; with

an

an Account of the Occaſions and Beginnings of it in the Weſtern Church. In Three Parts. With a Letter to the Vindicator of the Biſhop of *Condom*.

A Second Letter from the Author of the Diſcourſe concerning Extreme Unction to the Vindicator of the Biſhop of *Condom*.

The Pamphlet entituled, *Speculum Eccleſiaſticum*, or an Eccleſiaſtical Proſpective-Glaſs, conſidered, in its Falſe Reaſonings and Quotations. There are added, by way of Preface, two further Anſwers, the Firſt, to the Defender of the *Speculum*; the Second to the Half-ſheet againſt the *Six Conferences*.

A *Second Defence* of the Expoſition of the Doctrine of the Church of *England*, againſt the new Exceptions of *Monſ. de Meaux*, late Biſhop of *Condom*, and his Vindicator. The FIRST PART. In which the Account that has been given of the Biſhop of *Meaux's* Expoſition, is fully Vindicated; the Diſtinction of Old and New Popery *Hiſtorically* aſſerted, and the Doctrine of the Church of *Rome*, in Point of *Image-worſhip*, more particularly conſidered. 4°.

A *Second Defence* of the Expoſition of the Doctrine of the Church of *England*, againſt the New Exceptions of *Monſ. de Meaux*, late Biſhop of *Condom*, and his Vindicator. The SECOND PART. In which the *Romiſh* Doctrines concerning the Nature and Object of Religious Worſhip, of the Invocation of Saints, and Worſhip of Images and Relicks, are conſidred, and the Charge of Idolatry againſt the Church of *Rome*, upon the account of them, made good. 4°.

The Incurable Scepticiſm of the Church of *Rome*. By the Author of the [*Six Conferences concerning the Euchariſt.*] 4°.

Mr. *Pulton* Conſidered in his Sincerity, Reaſonings, Authorities: Or a Juſt Anſwer to what he hath hitherto publiſhed in his *True Account*; his *True and Full Account of a Conference*, &c. His *Remarks*; and in them his pretended Confutation of what he calls Dr. T's *Rule of Faith*. By *Th. Tenniſon*, D. D.

A Full View of the Doctrines and Practices of the *Ancient Church* relating to the *Euchariſt*, wholly different from thoſe of the *Preſent Roman Church*, and inconſiſtent with the belief of *Tranſubſtantiation*. Being a ſufficient Confutation of *Conſenſus Veterum*, *Nubes Teſtium*, and other late *Collections* of the *Fathers* pretending to the Contrary. 4°.

An Anſwer to the *Repreſenter's* Reflections upon the *State* and *View* of the Controverſy; With a Reply to the Vindicator's Full Anſwer, ſhewing that the Vindicator has utterly ruin'd the New Deſign of *Expounding* and *Repreſenting* Popery. 4°.

An Anſwer to the Addreſs preſented to the Miniſters of the Ch. of *England*, 4°.

Popery not founded in Scripture, or the Texts which Papiſts cite out of the *Bible* for Proofs of the Points of their Religion, examin'd and ſhew'd to be alledged without Ground.

An Abridgment of the Perogative of St. *Ann*, Mother of the Mother of God, with the Approbations of the Doctors of *Paris*, thence done into Engliſh, with a PREFACE concerning the Original of the Story.

The Primitive Fathers no Papiſts, in Anſwer to the *Nubes Teſtium*; to which is added, a Diſcourſe concerning *Invocation of Saints*, in Anſwer to the Challenge of *F. Sabran* the Jeſuit; wherein is ſhewn, that Invocation of Saints was ſo far from being the Practice, that it was expreſly againſt the Doctrine of the Primitive Fathers. 4°.

An Anſwer to a Diſcourſe concerning the Celibacy of the Clergy, lately Printed at *Oxford*. 4°.

In the Preſs.

The *Virgin Mary* Miſrepreſented by the *Roman* Church, In the Tradition of that Church concerning her Life and Glory, and in the Devotions paid to her as the Mother of God. Both ſhewed out of the Offices of that Church, the Legends on her Feſtivals, and from their allowed Authors.

Reflections upon the Books of the Holy Scripture, in order to eſtabliſh the Truth of the Chriſtian Religion, in 3 Parts. 8vo.